DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 884 PS 027 467

AUTHOR	Greene, Angela Dungee; Emig, Carol
TITLE	Conference on Father Involvement: A Summary Report (Bethesda, MD, October 10-11, 1996).
INSTITUTION	Child Trends, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, MD.; Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; Kaiser Foundation, Oakland, CA.
PUB DATE	1997-07-31
NOTE	52p.; Prepared for the NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Research Network by Child Trends, Inc.
AVAILABLE FROM	Child Trends, Inc., 4301 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 100, Washington, DC 20008; Tel: 202-362-5580; Fax: 202-362-5533.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Anthropology; Child Development; *Child Rearing; Child Support; *Children; Developmental Psychology; *Divorce; Economics; Family Structure; *Fathers; Marital Satisfaction; One Parent Family; *Parent Child Relationship; Parent Participation; *Parent Role; Predictor Variables; Program Evaluation; Sociology

ABSTRACT

Despite a strong and persistent interest in fathers and concern about their absence in children's lives, there is little information on the complex ways fathers make contributions to their families and children. Six major topic areas were covered by panels of experts during the conference: (1) economic, sociological, psychological, and anthropological perspectives on father involvement; (2) patterns of father involvement in two-parent and single-father families, child support and visitation patterns, and differences in patterns between biological and nonbiological fathers; (3) predictors of father involvement for divorced and unmarried fathers; (4) father involvement and outcomes among young children; (5) father involvement and outcomes among adolescents and young adults; and (6) father involvement and outcomes for fathers. A final panel of experts highlighted prevailing themes of the conference, pointed out policy implications, identified major perspectives on father involvement, and considered government's role. Following the main conference a half-day Methodology Workshop was held on October 12, 1996 to provide a forum for more in-depth discussion of methodological issues related to the study of father involvement. Issues discussed in the Methodology Workshop included survey design issues and the selection of survey topics. A list of conference papers is appended. (KB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 884

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

Conference on Father Involvement: A Summary Report

October 10-11, 1996
Bethesda, MD

Prepared for the NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Research Network
by
Child Trends, Inc.

Angela Dungee Greene
Carol Emig

July 31, 1997

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol A. Emig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PS 027467

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conference on Father Involvement:
A Summary Report

October 10-11, 1996
Bethesda, MD

Prepared for the NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Research Network
by
Child Trends, Inc.

Angela Dungee Greene
Carol Emig

July 31, 1997

Table of Contents

Preface i

Introduction 1

Perspectives on Father Involvement 6
- How has the operationalization of father involvement changed over time? 6
- What are the multidisciplinary perspectives on father involvement? 6
  - Economic perspectives on father involvement 6
  - Sociological perspectives on father involvement 7
  - Perspectives on father involvement from developmental psychology 8
  - Anthropological perspectives on father involvement 10

Patterns of Father Involvement 12
- What are the patterns of father care in two-parent families? 12
- What are some of the daily activities of fathers in two-parent families? 12
- What are the recent trends in single-father families? 13
- What are the trends in joint legal custody arrangements? 14
- What are the patterns of child support among nonresident fathers? 14
- Do child support and visitation patterns vary by race and reason for father's absence? 14
- Are there differences in the patterns of cooperative versus court-ordered child support payments? 15
- What are co-residence and visitation patterns of fathers of children born outside of marriage? 15
- What are the patterns of child support and visitation among African-American children in families on welfare? 16
- What are the patterns of both the quantity and quality of interactions between adolescents and their biological or nonbiological fathers? 16
- What are the patterns of both the quantity and quality of interaction between African-American adolescent males and their biological fathers or stepfathers? 17
- What are the patterns of involvement among biological fathers and nonbiological father figures of young, African-American children? 17

Predictors of Father Involvement 19
- What factors are associated with father involvement after divorce? 19
- What factors predict joint legal custody? 20
- Is joint legal custody associated with father-child visitation and the payment of child support? 20
- What factors predict the payment of child support after the disruption of marital or nonmarital unions? 21
- Are family-related policies associated with child support awards and receipt? 22
- What factors predict child support and father-child visitation among families on welfare? 23

What factors are associated with co-residence and visitation among fathers of nonmarital children? 24

Father Involvement and Outcomes among Young Children 26
Is father care during the preschool years associated with later outcomes among children in two-parent families? 26
Are there differences in cognitive and behavioral outcomes among children living in one-parent versus two-parent families? 27
Is child support associated with cognitive and behavioral outcomes among children? 28
Is cooperative child support more beneficial to child well-being than court-ordered child support? 28
Are formal and informal forms of child support associated with child outcomes among young children in families on welfare? 29
Is father-child contact associated with cognitive and behavioral outcomes? 29
Is biological and nonbiological father involvement associated with child outcomes among low-income preschool-age children? 30

Father Involvement and Outcomes among Adolescents and Young Adults 31
Are fathers' activities during adolescence associated with later outcomes among young adults from two-parent families? 31

What are the effects of marital disruption and marital quality on subsequent relationships between parents and their adult children? 32
Is there an association between father presence or father-son relationship quality during adolescence and patterns of family formation during adulthood? 33
Is father involvement associated with health risk behaviors among adolescents? 34

Father Involvement and Outcomes for Fathers 35
Is fathers' involvement with their nonmarital children associated with fathers' earnings? 35

What do these findings suggest? : Wrap up and conclusion session 36

The Methodology Workshop 38
Father involvement as a complex process 38
Approaches to the study of fathers 39
Survey design issues 40
The selection of survey topics 41
The four working groups 42

APPENDIX
List of Conference Papers 45

Preface

This report summarizes the presentations and findings from the "Conference on Father Involvement" which took place on October 10 and 11, 1996 and the half-day Methodology Workshop held on October 12, 1996. These activities were sponsored by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Family and Child Well-Being Research Network. Conference organizers invited noted researchers to present multidisciplinary perspectives on the study of fatherhood and empirical papers examining aspects of two broad and complementary questions pertaining to factors that predict increased involvement of fathers and the impact of father involvement on child outcomes. Following the main conference a Methodology Workshop was held to provide a forum for more in-depth discussion of methodological issues related to the study of father involvement.

This conference was the third in a year-long series of meetings designed to improve the capacity of the federal statistical system to conceptualize, measure, and gather information from men about their fertility and their role as fathers. This series of meetings was organized by representatives of the various federal agencies that gather and use data on children and families, with significant input from leading members of the research community and support from the Ford, Kaiser, and Annie E. Casey Foundations. In addition, the comprehensive work of the Center on Fathers and Families (NCOFF) at the University of Pennsylvania enhances the federal initiative to improve data on fathers. The other meetings in this series[1] are described in the introduction to this report (pp. 1-5).

Special thanks for planning and organizing the Conference on Father Involvement and the Methodology Workshop are given to Randal Day (Washington State University and the NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Research Network), H. Elizabeth Peters (Cornell University and the NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Research Network), and Desmond K. Runyan (University of North Carolina and the NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Research Network). Special thanks for managing the logistics of these activities are given to Gesine Hearn (NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Research Network) and Fanette Jones (Child Trends, Inc.).

This report was prepared by Angela Dungee Greene (Child Trends, Inc.) and edited by Carol Emig (Child Trends, Inc.). Subsequent meetings will add to the findings and recommendations presented here.

---

[1] The summary report of each conference in this series is available from Child Trends, Inc., 4301 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20008; (202) a 363-5580 fax: (202) 362-5533.

Introduction

A lively and often heated public debate on the value of two-parent families -- and more specifically on the value of the father in a family -- has been underway in the United States for much of the 1990s. Despite this strong and persistent interest in fathers and concern about their absence in children's lives, we are far from understanding the complex ways in which fathers make contributions to their families and children.

It is often assumed that the father's primary role is economic. Few researchers have attempted to ascertain what the bulk of fathers accomplish in families, how fathers approach this role, or how it is different from what the mother does. For example, how does the economic contribution of fathers affect families both directly and indirectly through a broad band of other resources? What are the substantial contributions they make as nurturer's, caretakers, and role models? How are these roles altered when children live in female-headed households due to divorce or nonmarital births, or when children live only with their fathers as is the case in a small but growing number of families? What factors lead fathers to be more or less involved with their children?

To examine these issues, the NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Research Network, an interdisciplinary group of scholars committed to bridging the gap between research and family policy, organized a conference on fathers on October 10 & 11, 1996, to address two broad and complementary questions:

- What is the effect of father involvement on child outcomes?
- What factors predict increased involvement of fathers?

Noted researchers were invited to present papers addressing aspects of these broad questions. To thoroughly examine the multifaceted issues, conference organizers requested that all papers include the following common features:

1. Father's involvement should be defined more broadly than just presence or absence. Examples include shared time, visitation of absent fathers, and psychological measures of closeness. The various mechanisms and processes through which fathers make contributions are of particular interest.

2. The focus should include biological or legal fathers. Although nonbiological father figures can play important roles in children's lives, policy makers are particularly interested in the links between psychological closeness and financial support from the biological/legal fathers. Some papers, however, do address the presence and role of nonbiological fathers or father figures.

3. Researchers should consider that the kinds of roles fathers can play will differ across family types. One goal of the conference was to improve understanding of those differences.

Some analyses make comparisons within the same paper, while other papers focus on a single family type.

4. Common topics were suggested for study. The invited researchers employed longitudinal, national probabilistic data sets (i.e., Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY), National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)), as well as smaller nonrepresentative data sets. The papers as a group use these multiple data sets to examine common identified topics. Agreement about measurement of key explanatory variables was provided by the conference coordinators, including the use of multiple dimensions of child outcomes and father involvement.

The two-day conference was comprised of seven sessions including a wrap-up segment (see Figure 1), where panelists highlighted common themes and offered a few recommendations for research, policy, and practice. Each session included time for comments by invited discussants representing policy organizations, community programs, and various academic disciplines. Prior to the conference, authors submitted their full-length research papers for review by their session's discussants. Conference organizers compiled the papers in a bound version, which they disseminated during and after the conference. This report features salient findings and methodological points from the papers and presentations. Many of the comments made by discussants are interspersed throughout the text. This report also includes a summary of the half-day Methodology Workshop held on October 12, 1996, which was organized to provide a forum for more in-depth discussion of methodological issues related to the study of father involvement.

This conference and workshop are part of a series of activities. The Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, which includes the major federal agencies responsible for gathering information on families and children, has taken the lead in efforts to improve the quality and quantity of data on fathers gathered by the federal government. In collaboration with private foundations, leading researchers and research centers, the Forum is sponsoring a series of interrelated conferences and meetings to review current approaches to gathering information on fathers and to explore new ways of conceptualizing, measuring, and collecting data about fatherhood and male fertility.

This series began with a Town Meeting on Fathering and Male Fertility in Washington D.C. on March 27, 1996. The Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics invited speakers to give short testimony on methodological, theoretical, and political problems concerning male data. On June 11-12, 1996, a major conference added to the knowledge gained at the Town Meeting, focusing on the substantive and methodological contributions that developmental, ethnographic, and anthropological research might make to improve federal data collection efforts and research on fathering.

On March 13-14 1997, the Federal Interagency Forum, together with NICHD and the Fatherhood Initiative of the Department of Health and Human Services, sponsored a conference

on measurement and data collection issues. This conference, the culmination of the year-long effort to improve federal data on fatherhood, produced specific recommendations for changes in how information on fathers and male fertility is gathered by federal agencies and by other public and private data collection efforts.

In preparation for this final conference, four working groups met to develop specific recommendations on how to improve federal data on men and fathers. Members of the working groups included experts from academia, government, and the private sector. The groups produced working papers on issues of family formation and male fertility, methodology, conceptualizing male parenting, and opportunities and trade-offs in revising and redesigning current federal data collection efforts. These working groups built on the information gathered at all of the preceding conferences and meetings on fatherhood, as well as information from private efforts. The March conference report will be available in the summer of 1997.

Figure 1

Conference on Father Involvement

Sponsored by the NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Network
Natcher Conference Center, National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Maryland
October 10 & 11, 1996

Agenda

Thursday, October 10

9:30 -12:00 **Session I: An Introduction**
Moderator: Jeff Evans, NICHD

Research on Father Involvement: An Historical Overview
Michael Lamb, NICHD

Multi-disciplinary Panel: Perspectives on Father Involvement
Robert J. Willis, University of Michigan
William Marsiglio, University of Florida
Ross Parke, University of California, Riverside
Barry Hewlett, Washington State University

12:00 **LUNCH**

1:15 - 3:15 **Session II: Involvement in Intact Families**
Moderator Lisa Bridges University of California, Riverside

Sibling Resemblance in Behavioral and Cognitive Outcomes: The Role of Father Presence
Jay Teachman, Washington State University
Randal Day, Washington State University
Vaughn Call, Brigham Young University
Karen Carver, University of North Carolina

Fathers as Providers of Child Care
H. Elizabeth Peters, Cornell University
Susan Averett, LaFayette College
Lisa Gennetian, Cornell University

Father's Time Allocation and Children's Well-Being
Greg Duncan, Northwestern University
Martha Hill, University of Michigan
Wei-Jun Jean Yeung, University of Michigan

Discussants: Cathleen Zick, University of Utah
Ed Pitt, Families and Work Institute, New York

3:15 - 5:00 **Session III: Unmarried Fathers**
Moderators Fran Goldscheider, Brown University

The Effect of Involvement on Father's Labor Market Outcomes
Robert Lerman, The Urban Institute
Elaine Sorensen, The Urban Institute

Predictors of Father Involvement and the Consequences for Children
Angela Dungee Greene, Child Trends, Inc.
Kristin A. Moore, Child Trends, Inc.

Absent Father 's Contributions to Child's Well-Being: Child Support and Father-Child Contact
Laura Argys, University of Colorado at Denver

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DINNER Speaker: James Garbarino, Cornell University "The *Soul of Fatherhood* "

Friday, October 11

9:00 -11:00 **Session IV: Father's Involvement After Marital Dissolution - I**
Moderator: Desmond Runyan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Custodial Father Households
Brett Brown, Child Trends, Inc.
The Impact of Divorce and Remarriage on the Relationships Between Parents and Their Children
Terri L. Orbuch, University of Michigan
Arland Thornton, University of Michigan
Jennifer Cancio, University of Michigan
Involving Fathers in the Post-Divorce Family
Sanford L. Braver, Arizona State University
William A. Griffin, Arizona State University

Discussants: Andrew Cherlin, Johns Hopkins University
Nicholas Zill, Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD

11:00 - 12:30 **Session V: Father's Involvement After Marital Dissolution - II**
Moderator: Randal Day, Washington State University

Nonresidential Parents ' Economic Ties to Children: New Evidence from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics
Pamela J. Smock, University of Michigan
Wendy D. Manning, Bowling Green University
Father by Law: Effects of Legal Custody on Nonresidential Fathers ' Involvement with Children
Judith A. Seltzer, University of Wisconsin

Discussants: Sara McLanahan, Princeton University
Burt Barnow Institute for Policy Studies, Baltimore, MD

12:30 LUNCH

1:30 - 3:15 **Session VI: Fathers of Children at Risk**
Moderator: Earl Johnson, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, San Francisco

The Role of Fathers in At-Risk Families with Older Children
Maureen Black, University of Maryland
Howard Dubowitz, University of Maryland
Ray Starr, University of Maryland
Intergenerational Transmission of Fathering Roles in At-Risk Families
Frank Furstenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Father's Influence on Teen Well-Being
Kathleen Mullan Harris, University of North Carolina

Discussants: Wendell Primus, The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Washington, D.C.
Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Columbia University

3:15 **Wrap-up and Conclusion**
Wade Horn, National Fatherhood Initiative
H. Elizabeth Peters, Cornell University
Nancy Hoit, Advisor to Vice President Gore and Consultant to the National Performance Review

4:00 **Adjourn**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Perspectives on Father Involvement

How has the operationalization of father involvement changed over time?

The conference opened with a brief presentation by Michael Lamb on the history of father involvement, with special focus on how the understanding and operationalization of involvement has changed over time. As he explained, fatherhood has always been a multifaceted concept, although over time the dominant or defining motif has shifted in turn from moral guidance, to breadwinning, then to sex role modeling, marital support, and finally nurturance. As a result of these changing concepts, the extent of father involvement has been viewed and indexed in different ways at different times. This makes cross-time comparisons both difficult to conduct and difficult to interpret.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, at a time when societal concerns about the effects of fatherlessness were coming to the forefront, social scientists became much more interested in the quantification of concepts such as father involvement, motivated in part by the emergence and popularity of time use methodologies. This prompted a shift from a focus on qualitative dimensions such as masculinity and dominance to quantifiable dimensions like the amount of time fathers spent with their children. According to Lamb, this shift led to a restricted focus on paternal nurturance, with little if any attention paid to the other functions or aspects of fatherhood. The narrowly focused view of fatherhood that resulted ignored subcultural variations in the definition and understanding of fatherhood. He pointed out that social scientists are only now beginning to seek a broader and more inclusive understanding of fatherhood. These efforts should permit more insightful research on the effects of variations in performance of the relevant roles.

What are the multidisciplinary perspectives on father involvement?

The first panel was comprised of Robert Willis, an economist; William Marsiglio, a sociologist; Ross Parke, a developmental psychologist; and Barry Hewlett, an anthropologist. Each characterized conceptual and methodological approaches to the study of father involvement from the perspective of his discipline and recommended directions for future research. Their presentations demonstrated and underscored the merit of a multidisciplinary approach to research in this area.

Economic perspectives on father involvement. According to Robert Willis, changes in marriage and fertility patterns have undermined studies that use households and married couples as the unit of analysis. For instance, early economic theories of fertility, including his own, view the unit of analysis as a household consisting of a husband and wife who jointly make decisions about fertility, childrearing, and their own marketplace and household productivity. In this model, there is no role for husbands other than breadwinner, while wives are viewed as both mothers and workers. This theory does not allow for the separate preferences of husbands and wives. They are assumed to share common preferences and to make cooperative decisions about marital fertility, child resource allocation, and the wife's employment based on the husband's income and the wife's market wage potential.

If fathers are breadwinners within marriage, they are expected to continue to be providers after marital dissolution. The upsurge in the divorce rate has accentuated problems associated with child support compliance. Willis indicated that the problem of "deadbeat" dads presents a puzzle for the economic theory of fertility. Willis referred to his collaborative research which views the individual rather than the couple as the unit of analysis. Men and women are viewed as separate actors who marry when it benefits them to combine resources and divorce when no allocation of resources can make both better off continuing in the marriage. According to this theory, fathers and mothers derive utility from their own consumption - a private good- and from the welfare of their children - a collective good.

Within marriage, both parents benefit from cooperatively pooling their resources for the household, but the cooperation between two parents may dissolve after divorce. Willis pointed to research showing that the noncustodial father will only make voluntary payments to his ex-wife if her income is sufficiently low that his failure to contribute would seriously jeopardize the well-being of their child. If the mother's income is higher than this level, the father will not make any voluntary contributions even though he continues to care about the child's well-being. Willis referred to other research showing that continued interaction between the father and child after divorce mitigates this tendency since the noncustodial father may be able to observe how his financial support provides resources for the child.

Willis noted that nonmarital childbearing is another puzzle for economists. For instance, the theory of collective goods within marriage cannot account for the motivation of women who bear children outside of marriage and receive little or no support from fathers. However, Willis explained that the theory of collective goods may apply to nonmarital childbearing if a woman who desires children has sufficient income available through her own earnings or public transfers to choose to have a child regardless of the father's ability or willingness to contribute. When women outnumber men in the marriage market and an excess number of women are willing and able to assume the responsibilities of childbearing and childrearing, some men, especially those in marginal economic circumstances, may reject conventional marriage and opt for "costless fatherhood."

Willis recommended that researchers, including economists, view men and women as individual actors with their own interests and resources. Individuals rather than households should be the unit of analysis. Willis also recommended that researchers explore the multiple dimensions of father involvement beyond the perspective of fathers as breadwinners. Additionally, empirical work in the area should not be limited to fathers and mothers who have lived together. Noncohabiting parental relationships are important, especially in light of the varying circumstances of nonmarital childbearing and childrearing. Willis noted that there is great potential for empirical work regarding the extent to which major changes in the connection between marital behavior and fertility behavior can be understood within economic theories of the family.

Sociological perspectives on father involvement. William Marsiglio began his presentation by noting that he rarely distinguishes between related disciplinary perspectives within the social sciences, and therefore his overview of sociological themes may traverse disciplinary boundaries. He explained that sociology focuses on social processes and social structures and the interplay between the concepts. The sociological perspective proposes that there are social patterns

underlying the way individuals think, feel and act. Most sociologists examine the subject of fathers' involvement and children's outcomes from a sociodemographic or social psychological perspective. Sociodemographic analyses usually examine the relative importance of family structure and individual background factors of fathers, mothers, and children as predictors of resident or nonresident father involvement. In some cases, analyses focus on the relationship between father involvement and child outcomes. As Marsiglio noted, policy analysts and the popular press often refer to sociodemographic research. The social psychological approach extends from the social psychology of fatherhood and examines the social factors that affect how fathers develop their sense of identity as fathers and their paternal roles. Marsiglio pointed out that the sociodemographic and social psychological approaches are sometimes interrelated and recommended integrating the two more often.

Marsiglio also highlighted the common research methods and theoretical frameworks characteristic of sociological inquiry in the area of father involvement. Sociologists use quantitative data analysis techniques to examine cross-sectional or longitudinal data from large national surveys. They also employ qualitative methods consisting of in-depth interviews with small samples or ethnographic designs to capture important nuances. Sociologists have used many different theoretical frameworks, such as social exchange, symbolic interactionism, sociobiology, life course, conflict or feminist oriented approaches. However, their guiding theories are most often some combination of symbolic interactionism, life course models, and identity theories, which propose that fathers' activities and roles are performed within the context of a dynamic social process that connects individuals to larger social environments. He pointed out that most of the questions sociologists have addressed focus on what may be termed "enabling" and "constraining" factors that affect fathers' levels and types of involvement. Sociologists are interested in how fathers adapt their roles during transitions including job loss, the blending of families, unplanned births to uncommitted couples and the dissolution of marital and nonmarital relationships. They also examine how women mediate the interactions between fathers and their children, and how gender-related norms, patterns, and hierarchies in the family and the labor market affect fathers' roles.

Marsiglio recommended additional research in the sociology of emotions, an expanding area which may offer insights into the association between fathers' emotional commitment to their children and their involvement. He also encouraged social demographers and social psychologists to develop new ways of integrating their interests and approaches in combined data collection efforts. Marsiglio pointed out that sociologists can contribute in a practical way to the development of research-based and theoretically informed programs for fathers and families. In addition, ongoing research in other fields has the potential to inform sociological inquiry. Marsiglio referred to the merits of incorporating insights from biomedical research on gender differences, which may reveal biologically-based reasons for differences in maternal and paternal involvement with children. Finally, Marsiglio described his most recent theoretical work on the prenatal and postnatal aspects of men's lives as procreative beings. He stressed the importance of integrating cultural, interpersonal, intrapsychic, and, in some cases, developmental dimensions when conceptualizing men's procreative and fatherhood experiences.

Perspectives on father involvement from developmental psychology. Ross Parke first noted that the study of father involvement has become increasingly interdisciplinary because it is too important and complex to be the focus solely of psychology or any one discipline. Parke pointed

out that there are various types of father involvement and emphasized the importance of defining father involvement as a continuum, rather than a father presence versus father absence dichotomy. He also asserted that social context is salient to the study of father involvement. Fathers assume multiple roles in interaction with a large world that extends from soccer practice to the job market. In addition, the distinction between quantity and quality of involvement is of central importance. Research by developmental psychologists has shown that children's developmental outcomes are associated with the quality rather than merely the quantity of involvement.

Parke also emphasized the merits of viewing fatherhood from a multifaceted developmental perspective. Typically, the developmental perspective views father-child interactions in relation to the age of the child. Over the years, most research in this area has focused on the infancy stage of child development, and more recently, some studies have examined father-child relationships during adolescence. However, Parke recommended additional research on the effect of father involvement on child development during the early school years or middle childhood to address the sparsity of studies in this area. In addition, he emphasized the need to advance beyond linear descriptions of the association between father-child interactions and child outcomes to instead identify important mediating processes. For instance, an important consideration is whether father involvement affects child outcomes directly or indirectly through changes in maternal attitudes or behaviors.

The developmental perspective also includes a life course approach to the study of fathers. For instance, "father time" or the age at which the male becomes a father and the life course issues related to age, such as lifestyle, occupation, education, and even energy level affect the degree and nature of father involvement. According to Parke, another salient timing issue is "family time", or the timing of family events, such as residential mobility, divorce, separation, or other family-related transitions. Finally, the life course perspective also highlights the historical context or changes in the secular realm over time that may reshape the roles fathers assume. Parke pointed out that father time, family time, and historical time are interrelated yet sometimes disharmonizing factors.

Asserting that there is no "silver bullet" for understanding the determinants of father involvement, Parke proposed a multivariate framework with five levels: 1) individual influences, 2) dyadic and triadic family relationships, 3) extrafamilial influences or informal support systems (relationships with relatives, friends, neighbors), 4) institutional or formal influences, and 5) cultural influences. Each level of determinants has multiple components, and the multiple levels and components are interrelated parts of a complex system.

As Parke pointed out, multiple methods are necessary for understanding fathers. For instance, observational studies of the interaction patterns of fathers with their partners and their children reveal insights and nuances that survey methods are unable to capture. Researchers now use replication strategies and multi-stage sampling approaches to increase the population representativeness of small-scale, observational studies. Parke suggested the multi-method approach of first employing a nationally representative survey and then selecting a subsample of the larger group for observational study. He also noted the usefulness of focus groups for questionnaire development and assessing the cultural equivalence of instruments. Parke indicated that typical non-experimental research strategies may be insufficient to address the

salient issue of the causal direction of the impact of fathers on children and families. He referred to the merits of experimental designs which allow the experimental manipulation of fathers' behavior or levels of involvement and direct observation of the effects on child or family outcomes. These methods may provide firmer conclusions regarding the direct causal effects of father involvement on children and families.

Anthropological perspectives on father involvement. Barry Hewlett began his presentation by recommending what he termed "transdisciplinary" work, which refers to research conducted through close collaboration among researchers across disciplines to enhance the breadth and quality of investigations. Hewlett explained that anthropologists are not theorists per se; instead they spend most of their time in the field observing human behavior. The unifying concept in anthropology is culture, defined minimally as shared knowledge and practices that are transmitted from generation to generation non-genetically. Hewlett noted that people tend to believe their cultural patterns and routines are universal until they are faced with starkly different perspectives. For the most part, culture is ethnocentric, and this ethnocentrism is not limited to Western societies. For example, placing infants in a crib in their own room to sleep - a common practice in the U.S. - is viewed by the Aka people of West Africa as a form of child neglect. In their culture, constantly holding one's infant is good parenting practice.

Hewlett emphasized the importance of understanding the multiple, complex factors that influence cultural patterns of father involvement. He referred to his in-depth study of Aka fathers, which revealed that they are either holding or within an arm's length of their infants more than 50 percent of the time in a 24-hour period. This high level of father involvement is attributed to interrelated factors, including high fertility, no warfare, flexible gender roles, male-female cooperative net hunting, and high valuing of both male and female children. Hewlett pointed out that findings on Aka father-child interactions have implications for fathers and children in the U.S. These findings suggest that the quantity of time rather than the quality of time fathers spend with their children is key to their attachment. In contrast to fathers in the U.S., Aka fathers do not have to stimulate interactions with their infants through vigorous play to form attachments. Aka infants become attached to their fathers through frequent holding and communication, and the bonds remain over time.

According to Hewlett, Aka data also support the hypotheses of sociologist Nancy Chodorow who proposes that when fathers are active in infant care, boys develop a perception of the male gender role that leads to greater gender egalitarianism, and the status of women increases. Crosscultural data show that as father involvement increases, the participation of women in political decisions also increases. Similarly, Aka data and other crosscultural studies indicate that close husband-wife relations and relatively equal provider roles are associated with greater father involvement.

Hewlett included references to evolutionary ecology, noting that anthropologists are interested in human nature, human biology, the evolutionary history of humans, and therefore developments in evolutionary theory. He referred to a conceptual contribution of evolutionary theory to the study of fathers. Evolutionary ecologists use the term "investment" rather than "involvement" to include all direct and indirect ways fathers and mothers contribute to their children across cultures. Examples of direct paternal investments are caregiving, playing, availability, inheritance, protection, and provision of resources. Indirect investments include kin

networks, support of the wife, and maintenance of the home. Referring to crosscultural differences in investments, Hewlett noted that fathers in agriculturally-based, developing countries may not appear to be involved with their children by Western standards, but they are investing in the physical and social well-being of their children in other significant ways.

Anthropologists in the area of international development find that cultural change is facilitated by building on existing beliefs and practices. Therefore, Hewlett recommended encouraging father involvement through positive, edifying methods rather than the use of negative images and references like "deadbeat dads." In addition, Hewlett recommended that any national program for fathers reflect the economic, demographic, cultural, and intracultural diversity that exists within the United States.

Patterns of Father Involvement

Fathers are involved in the lives of their children in various ways. Most of the empirical studies presented were multivariate analyses designed to examine predictors of father involvement and/or father involvement as a predictor of child outcomes. However, many also included descriptive data on the patterns and trends of various father involvement measures. This section summarizes the authors' descriptive findings as presented in the context of two-parent, divorced, or never-married family structures. Forms of involvement include child care, daily activities, joint legal custody, co-residence, visitation, child support, closeness, and nurturance.

What are the patterns of father care in two-parent families?

Susan Averett, Lisa Gennetian, and Elizabeth Peters pointed out that fathers are an understudied but important source of child care. Their retrospective study focuses on the patterns of child care and child outcomes among children ages five to eight who as preschoolers were either cared for by their father or placed in other child care arrangements while their mother worked outside the home. Child supplement data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) show that the proportion of children cared for by their father remained similar across ages one through three. For instance, during the first year of life, 12.4 percent of the children were cared for by their father. During years two and three, 11.3 percent and 12.7 percent of children, respectively, were cared for by their fathers. The percentage of children cared for by non-relatives is considerably higher than the percentage of children cared for by their fathers, but like father care, the pattern also remains relatively consistent over the years. On the other hand, younger children are more likely to be cared for by other relatives, while older children are more likely to be in center-based day care. Because about 25 percent of the children were in more than one child care arrangement in a given year, Averett, Genetian, and Peters also classified the child care arrangements as concurrent, sequential, or the only one used during the year. They found that compared to other child care arrangements, care by the father is much less likely to be the only care used during each of the three years and much more likely to be categorized as a concurrent source of care.

What are some of the daily activities of fathers in two-parent families?

Greg Duncan, Martha Hill, and Jean Yeung used data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) to assess how fathers' characteristics, including involvement with their children during middle childhood and adolescence, affect the adult success of these children. Their independent measures are based on survey data collected between 1968 and 1972. Measures of fathers' daily activities include time allocated to market work and housework, and their findings reflect traditional gender roles characteristic of the time period. Fathers averaged 2300 hours of market work annually but only 90 hours of housework, while mothers averaged only about 500 hours of market work but almost 2000 hours of housework. Interestingly, children were found to average more than twice the number of hours of housework their fathers performed.

Duncan, Hill, and Yeung also included several other measures of fathers' activities. Because of differences in the scaling of items over the survey years, the authors developed

dichotomous measures to show which fathers ever reported involvement in a given activity during the five-year period. Nearly all fathers reported ever watching TV, eating together with their family at least one night per week, and reading the paper. Similarly, more than 90 percent of fathers ever took vacations, or attended religious services. On the other hand, far fewer fathers reported that they ever participated in other less family focused or home-oriented activities, such as going to social clubs, going to bars, or taking lessons of some kind.

What are the recent trends in single-father families?

Brett Brown explored the understudied topic of single-father families using data from the March Current Population Surveys (CPS). His findings reveal that the proportion of single fathers as a percentage of all families grew from 3.6 in 1984 to 4.8 in 1989, and to 5.8 in 1994. In 1994, two-thirds of these were non-cohabiting single fathers, and one-third were cohabiting with a housemate or partner of the opposite sex. Brown noted that cohabiting single-fathers accounted for about 60 percent of the increase in single father families during both the 1984-89 and the 1989-94 periods.

Apparently a significant number of never-married fathers willingly assume primary parental responsibility for their children: one in five non-cohabiting fathers had never been married. Similarly, more than one-third of cohabiting single fathers were separated, divorced, or widowed. This finding suggests that a substantial portion of single fathers may bring their children from prior marriages into their cohabiting relationships, so cohabiting fathers are not exclusively those living with the unmarried mothers of their children. As Nicholas Zill noted, this descriptive data from the CPS does not indicate why the child resides with the father. The reason may relate to a particular problem involving the mother or behavior problems of the child.

Overall, most single fathers, especially cohabiting single fathers, are the heads of their own households. Among non-cohabiting fathers, 13 percent live in households headed by their parent or another relative. Brown pointed out that shared living arrangements may enhance the material circumstances of single fathers and their families and assist fathers with child care and supervision.

Brown also compared single fathers with married fathers in terms of several characteristics. Most strikingly single-father families are quite disadvantaged relative to married-couple families and more often receive public transfers. For instance, single fathers have fewer years of education, are twice as likely to be poor, and earn an average of $10,000 less than married fathers. The public transfer single fathers most commonly receive is the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). A full 61 percent of cohabiting single fathers and 43 percent of noncohabiting single fathers receive EITC compared to only 15 percent of married fathers. Children of single fathers are more likely to receive free or reduced priced lunches and public health insurance coverage. Single fathers were substantially more likely than married fathers to live in households receiving food stamps, public assistance and Medicaid/ Medicare, with cohabiting single fathers the most likely to receive such aid.

Brown pointed out that the extent of single fathers' dependence on public transfers has important policy implications. Reductions in public transfers, especially the EITC and the Medicaid and Medicare public health insurance programs, may quite negatively affect the lives

of single fathers and their families. The families of cohabiting single fathers have the highest rates of public transfer receipt, particularly AFDC, so they may be subject to even greater hardship if reductions occur.

What are the trends in joint legal custody arrangements?

Judith Seltzer used data from the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) to examine joint legal custody and child support arrangements for 164 families in which the parents were married at the time of the first wave of the survey in 1987-88 but divorced by the second wave of the survey, 1992-1994. Because of data limitations, Seltzer restricted her sample to cases in which the focal child lives with the mother at the time of the second wave of interviews and the father is the nonresident parent. About 49 percent of families in this sample have joint legal custody arrangements. Seltzer observed that this figure represents an increase since the mid 1980s when, according to her tabulation of NSFH wave one data, about 41 percent of divorced families with a legal agreement had joint legal custody. She noted a consistent increasing trend in joint custody agreements over the decades of the 1970's and 1980's.

What are the patterns of child support among nonresident fathers?

Using matched ex-couple data from the PSID, Pamela Smock and Wendy Manning analyzed indicators of formal and informal child support payments paid or received as reported in 1994 by the nonresident or resident parent, respectively. Their matched sample consists of 220 couples who lived together but dissolved their marital or nonmarital union some time between the birth of the focal child and the 1992 survey. Tests for selection bias confirmed that their matched sample is not selective in terms of child support. Smock and Manning outlined three research objectives, one of which was to assess differences in child support levels received and paid as reported by the resident and nonresident parent, respectively. They noted that in the vast majority of cases, nonresident parents were fathers rather than mothers.

There were no significant differences between nonresident and resident parent's reports of child support. Fifty-five percent of nonresident parents reported paying child support, and 52 percent of resident parents reported receiving it. Similarly, in terms of the amount of child support, resident parents reported contributing an average of $4900 a year.

Do child support and visitation patterns vary by race and reason for father's absence?

In their study of child support awards and child outcomes, Laura Argys, Elizabeth Peters, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, and Judy Smith found that child support receipt varies by race and reason for father's absence. Mother-reported data from the NLSY show that white divorced or separated women received child support in 60 percent of the years since marital dissolution, while black divorced or separated women received child support in slightly less than 40 percent of the corresponding years. Overall, mothers of children born outside of marriage had lower rates of child support receipt than mothers in the divorced or separated sample, and among mothers of children born outside of marriage, white mothers were more likely to receive child support than black mothers.

The findings for father-child visitation revealed a different pattern. Black fathers of children in the nonmarital sample were more likely to have contact with their children than were their white counterparts, but within the divorced or separated sample, black fathers were comparatively less likely to have contact with their children.

Are there differences in the patterns of cooperative versus court-ordered child support payments?

Argys and her colleagues also compared cooperative versus court-ordered child support awards and payments using data from the NLSY. According to their definition, cooperative child support agreements include those reached between parents with or without the assistance of an attorney. Argys and her colleagues referred to the remaining court-ordered awards as non-cooperative. About one-third of the nonmarital sample and nearly one-half of the divorced or separated sample who had child support awards reported that the agreements were decided with or without attorney assistance. The cooperative category also included cases in which there was no legal award agreement but fathers voluntarily paid child support at some time after leaving the household or since the child's birth in nonmarital cases. Twenty-four percent of divorced or separated mothers and 47 percent of mothers in the nonmarital sample received voluntary payments. In sum, cooperative awards are more common among the divorced or separated sample than the nonmarital sample, and voluntary payments from fathers without child support awards are more common among the nonmarital sample than the divorced or separated sample.

What are co-residence and visitation patterns of fathers of children born outside of marriage?

Using father-reported data from the NLSY, Robert Lerman and Elaine Sorensen examined the complex patterns of nonmarital childbearing and father involvement among young men under age 35 in the 1992 survey year. They observed that there are several possible patterns of involvement even at one point in time. For instance, some fathers have one child outside of marriage, marry the mother of their child, remain married and have additional children. In other cases, fathers have one child outside of marriage, never marry the mother of the child or cohabit with her, but these fathers visit their child frequently. On the other hand, some men have several children outside of marriage and are not currently visiting any of them. Of course, these patterns vary considerably within each scenario and may become even more complex over time as father involvement deteriorates, intensifies, or remains the same.

Lerman and Sorensen classified father involvement with nonmarital children in a way that takes account of living arrangements, marriage, and visitation. They viewed fathers who live with their children as the most involved fathers, marrying and living with the mother demonstrating a more long-term commitment than cohabitation outside of marriage. Among nonresident fathers in their sample, visitation categories indicate levels of involvement ranging from at least weekly to no visits at all. When they examined the maximum involvement of fathers with any one of their nonmarital children, they observed that nearly 50 percent of fathers were living with the child and another 20 percent visited at least once a week. African-American fathers were less likely than white or Hispanic fathers to live with a nonmarital child, but more likely to visit frequently. Overall, of the remaining 30 percent of fathers who were not highly involved, about half were married to someone other than the mother of their nonmarital

children and two-thirds of these men had fathered another child within marriage. As Lerman and Sorensen noted, these findings indicate that the majority of fathers under age 35 who have one or more nonmarital children have close involvement with at least one of them. Many fathers who do not live with or frequently visit at least one of their nonmarital children have married and are living with a marital child.

What are the patterns of child support and visitation among African-American children in families on welfare?

Angela Greene and Kristin Moore also included a measure of voluntary child support in their study of father involvement among nonresident fathers of children who receive welfare. They focused on a sample of African-American mothers (most of whom had never married) and their preschool-age children from the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Child Outcome Study, a substudy of the larger random assignment evaluation of the Federal JOBS program. Greene and Moore examined father-child visitation and two child support measures, formal and informal child support. In their study, formal child support refers to the cash payments that mothers who have voluntary or court-ordered awards receive from fathers through the formal child support enforcement system. Informal child support, which is considered a voluntary contribution, is not contingent on the existence of an award agreement and indicates cash or in-kind contributions fathers offer directly to mothers in addition to or in lieu of formal child support payments. According to mothers' reports, only 16.6 percent of the fathers provided child support through the formal system during the past year, while a considerably larger proportion, 42.3 percent, provided informal child support, such as money given directly to the mother, groceries, clothes, or other items. However, visitation was the most common form of involvement for this sample. Sixty-seven percent of children saw their father at least once in the past year. The modal category for visitation indicates that 21.3 percent of children saw their fathers between two and 11 times during the past year, while in contrast, 6 percent saw their fathers almost every day.

What are the patterns of both the quantity and quality of interactions between adolescents and their biological or nonbiological fathers?

While most of the papers presented focused on resident and nonresident biological fathers, a few authors extended the definition of fathers to include nonbiological or social fathers. For example, Kathleen Harris presented preliminary findings based on data from the 1995 National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Ad Health), a nationally representative survey of the health and risk behaviors of adolescents who were in grades 7 through 12 in 1995. The survey design contains an over-sample of diverse family forms including various types of blended and step-families. Therefore, Harris' analysis of father involvement and risk behaviors among adolescents was able to include resident biological parents and nonbiological parents, such as step, foster, adoptive parents, and parental partners. Harris first described the percentage distribution of adolescents by family structure, noting that about half (49.8 percent) of adolescents live with two biological parents. Additionally, while 24 percent of adolescents live with a single mother, only 3.5 percent live with a single father. Similarly, 11 percent of adolescents live with a biological mother and nonbiological father, while only 2.4 percent live with a biological father and nonbiological mother. The remaining adolescents live with other adult relatives or nonrelatives.

Harris developed a measure of adolescent-reported father involvement that includes four dimensions: shared activities, affect or closeness, conflict, and communication. She referred to shared activities, conflict, and communication as measures of the quantity of involvement. Affect or closeness in the relationship and the level of communication between fathers and adolescents are measures of the quality of involvement. According to her preliminary findings, resident fathers in two-parent families and single-father families exhibit higher levels of involvement than resident fathers in the other family structures across all dimensions. Harris also observed that 30 percent of resident fathers were highly involved with their adolescents as measured by an index which combines the optimal categories of each dimension: one or more shared activities with father, very or extremely close to father, no conflict over behavior, talked about two or more topics with father.

What are the patterns of both the quantity and quality of interaction between African-American adolescent males and their biological fathers or stepfathers?

Frank Furstenberg analyzed data from the young adult male offspring of a sample of women in Baltimore studied since they became adolescent mothers in the mid-1960s. He examined information on both biological fathers and stepfathers, including mothers' partners, and measures of both the quantity and quality of father-son interactions. For instance, co-residence patterns among biological fathers reveal that nearly 75 percent of biological fathers never lived with their sons for a full year, only 12 percent lived with their sons continuously after the first one to two years following their birth, and the remaining fathers lived with their sons between one and 14 years but were not in the home by mid-adolescence. Among nonresident fathers, about 35 percent visited their sons at least monthly, while 30 percent of nonresident fathers maintained only occasional contact and 34 percent had no contact with their sons. Furstenberg also observed that most of the young men lived with a stepfather or their mother's partner at least some time during childhood. However, continuous father presence was uncommon in that fewer than one-fourth of the young men lived with a biological or nonbiological father continuously throughout their childhood and into adolescence.

To measure the quality of the father-son relationship, Furstenberg constructed an index based on items measuring the degree of father-son closeness and the extent to which the son wanted to be like his father when he reached adulthood. The questions were asked only of males who lived with their father or saw him regularly. About 79 percent of the boys who were living with their biological father felt close to him and wanted to be like him. On the other hand, these sentiments were expressed by only 17 percent of males with nonresident biological fathers and by 30 percent of those with nonbiological fathers they lived with for at least ten years. These preliminary findings suggest the prevalence of merely tenuous attachments to biological fathers who reside outside the home and to nonbiological fathers within the home.

What are the patterns of involvement among biological fathers and nonbiological father figures of young, African-American children?

Maureen Black, Howard Dubowitz, and Raymond Starr extended the definition of father to include nonbiological father figures who may be important in the lives of children, particularly children facing challenging circumstances. Black and her colleagues recruited 175 African-American 3-year-old children and their families from three pediatric clinics serving low-income

urban families. Based on mothers' reports, they identified 128 fathers and obtained the participation of 82 of them. Black and her colleagues noted that participating fathers were not demographically different from nonparticipating fathers in the sample. In terms of their relationship to the focal child, more than half (59 percent) of participating fathers were the child's biological father, and nonbiological father figures included the mother's partner (26 percent), other relatives (7 percent), and friends (7 percent). Although 61 percent of the fathers lived with their child, only 16 percent were married to the mother.

Despite the varied forms of attachment to the mothers and children, these fathers exhibited substantial levels of involvement. For example, a full 71 percent of fathers reported weekly financial contributions to their child's household and 17 percent of fathers reported providing monthly contributions. Their average scores on the "Who does what" scale of child care and household tasks indicate that these fathers share responsibilities equally with mothers. Additionally, Black and her colleagues assessed paternal nurturance based on videotaped observations of fathers playing with their children. Warmth, structure, and engagement were the three salient factors that comprised paternal nurturance, and these fathers attained a high mean score on the measure.

Predictors of Father Involvement

What factors are associated with increased father involvement? Several conference papers addressed aspects of this important question through the use of multivariate methods. This section summarizes authors' findings on the predictors of various forms of resident and nonresident father involvement.

What factors are associated with father involvement after divorce?

Sanford Braver and William Griffin focused on the circumstances that facilitate or impede involvement by nonresident fathers after divorce. They employed data from two studies involving mostly matched couples from divorcing families in Phoenix, Arizona. The first data set is a longitudinal study of 300 couples randomly selected from court records. The couples were first interviewed within weeks of their divorce decree. Both parents were reinterviewed a year later and again two years after the second interview. The second data set consists of interviews with 93 couples three to six months after their final divorce decree in 1995. To examine the circumstances related to father visitation, couples were asked what proportion of scheduled visits noncustodial fathers willfully missed, and whether the custodial mothers ever denied visitation to the noncustodial fathers. Fathers reported that they only missed about 3 percent of scheduled visits with their children, while mothers reported that the fathers missed about 12 percent of scheduled visits. According to about one third of the fathers, their visitation privileges were denied at least once by custodial mothers, and about 25 percent of custodial mothers admitted to denying visitation. Braver and Griffin referred to the common perception of willfully neglectful "bad dads" and pointed out that this finding suggests the post-divorce relationship between mothers and fathers maybe more important than the "badness" of the father.

Braver and Griffin used longitudinal data to identify variables associated with child support compliance and visitation. They viewed 25 possible explanations for fathers' lack of involvement including anger at his ex-wife, lack of strong ties to the child, immorality, etc. Their cross-sectional findings showed the salient factor to be the fathers' "perceived control" over the divorce settlement and child-rearing issues - a factor the authors referred to as "feeling parentally enfranchised". Fathers who felt their ex-wife maintained control over all aspects of the divorce process and all childrearing decisions were parentally disenfranchised. These fathers resented that they had the responsibilities of parenthood without the privileges. Braver and Griffin referred to their longitudinal data, which provided evidence of a causal sequence in structural models. Apparently, fathers pay child support and maintain contact because they feel parentally enfranchised rather than the reverse sequence.

To provide additional support for their contention, Braver and Griffin referred to several questions asked of parents about their satisfaction with the divorce process. They consistently found that mothers were more satisfied than fathers with all provisions. They observed that mothers feel more in control of the overall legal process and are more likely to get what they want, for instance custody of the children. When asked how they would describe the slant of the Arizona legal system regarding divorced parents, the majority of fathers believed the system favored mothers. While most mothers felt the system was balanced, three times as many mothers thought the system favored them compared to those who thought it favored fathers.

Braver and Griffin emphasized that, overall, these findings suggest that non- involvement is more closely linked to fathers' circumstances than to fathers' individual characteristics. They described an intervention they designed to address post-divorce relationship issues. "Dads for Life" is an eight-week program primarily aimed at increasing child well-being after a divorce by changing the skills, attitudes, and behaviors of the father. The intervention focuses on the quality and quantity of the father-child relationship and the nature of the father-mother relationship. The experimental field trial of the intervention will begin soon. Families will be randomly assigned to the intervention group or the control group, which will receive the best available self-help literature. Braver and Griffin showed segments of a video about the intervention.

During the discussion segment, Andrew Cherlin pointed out that some fathers are indeed neglectful fathers or "deadbeat dads." He also noted a study that found the strength of the father-child relationship rather than the amount of visitation affected adolescent well-being. However, he felt that, if low-level, occasional interactions are beneficial, they can be enhanced by an intervention like "Dads for Life."

What factors predict joint legal custody?

Seltzer addressed the question of whether joint legal custody is more likely when parents have less pre-separation conflict and fathers are closer to their children before divorce or union disruption. Her analysis of NSFH data incorporates pre-separation measures of reports from both mothers and fathers on the amount of conflict and degree of happiness associated with their relationship, reports from fathers on the quality of their relationship with the focal child, as well as each parent's education and income, the number of minor children, whether any children are under age six, and union duration. According to Seltzer's findings, father's education and income are the only two factors associated with an increase in the likelihood of joint legal custody, and father's education is the only factor that remains marginally significant after all family characteristics are included in the logistic regression model. Seltzer noted that this pattern is consistent with previous research and may suggest socioeconomic selection regarding joint legal custody. In other words, parents with more resources may be more likely to know about and obtain joint legal custody as an alternative to sole custody arrangements. Apparently, none of the pre-separation measures of the quality of the relationship between parents or between fathers and their children are predictive of joint legal custody.

Is joint legal custody associated with father-child visitation and the payment of child support?

Seltzer's analyses of NSFH wave two data reveal that fathers with joint legal custody are more likely to have seen their child at least weekly compared to those without joint legal custody. Fathers with joint legal custody are also more likely to have overnight visits with their children, and to have more such visits during the course of the year. Seltzer found that fathers with joint legal custody have higher levels of contact with their children and pay more child support than fathers in families in which the mother had sole legal custody, even after parents' characteristics and quality of relationship factors are taken into account.

Seltzer noted that only one relationship factor is associated with an indicator of father-child contact. Fathers who reported that their relationship with their child was excellent prior to

separation have more overnight visits with their child than fathers who reported relationships of lower quality. In addition, these fathers pay about $1600 more a year in child support, a significantly higher level. However, Seltzer pointed out that fathers with joint legal custody make relatively higher child support payments because they owe more child support than fathers without legal custody. In fact, after controlling for socioeconomic status and other family characteristics, there are no differences between fathers with joint legal custody and those without in terms of child support compliance.

Sara McClanahan pointed out that there may be policy implications associated with findings that joint custody is associated with greater contact and payment. She also noted that other important related questions may be whether joint legal custody reduces post-divorce conflict between mothers and fathers or affects fathers' belief that they can influence the lives of their children.

What factors predict the payment of child support after the disruption of marital or nonmarital unions?

Due to data limitations, most studies that examine the determinants of child support payment rely on characteristics of the resident parent and indirect reports of the nonresident parent's characteristics. However, Smock and Manning used unique matched ex-couple data available from the PSID for previously married or cohabiting couples to assess the relative merits of predicting child support payments using solely the direct reports of nonresident parents' characteristics, or solely direct reports of resident parents' characteristics, compared with both parents' characteristics. The two child support indicators are measured in thousands of dollars and include formal and informal payments paid or received as reported in the 1994 survey by the nonresident or resident parent, respectively. Their independent variables include measures of parents' characteristics, such as years of education, pre-and post-union dissolution earnings, present marital status, new biological or step children, and the age of the nonresident parent. They also take into account couple characteristics including union duration, number of minor children born within the union, time since separation, race/ethnicity, whether the father is the resident parent, and whether the resident mother received AFDC in the past year.

Smock and Manning estimated a series of bivariate tobit equations predicting the amount of child support paid and received. In addition to couple characteristics, the first model included the resident parent's characteristics, the second included the nonresident parent's characteristics, and the third model included the characteristics of both resident and nonresident parents. Their third model showed that nonresident parents' current and pre-dissolution earnings are associated with increases in annual child support received. For example, the coefficients indicate that a $1,000 increase in the nonresident parent's current earnings is associated with a $128-132 increase in annual child support received the nonresident parent, and a $1,000 increase in pre-dissolution earnings is associated with a $176 increase in annual child support. On the other hand, the resident parent's current earnings are positively associated with child support received, but their pre-dissolution earnings are negatively associated with child support received. Smock and Manning point out that the resident parent's earnings may proxy for their access to resources to pursue child support and reduce their economic need. Overall, the net effect of resident parents' earnings at these two time points is associated with a decrease in child support received.

Additional findings indicate that resident fathers, who constituted only 20 percent of resident parents, receive less child support than resident mothers. Both the number of children in the marital union and the nonresident parent's schooling are positively associated with the amount of child support received. The other parental and couple characteristics do not appear to be associated with child support receipt. According to Smock and Manning, the test of equality of coefficients across the models indicate that the independent variables have similar effects regardless of whether the dependent variable is child support paid or child support received; both appear to be measuring the same construct. Additionally, Smock and Manning concluded that based on the tests of model fit, the optimal fit is obtained by including both parents' characteristics or only nonresident parents' characteristics. Nonresident parents' characteristics are the most salient, and one of the most important predictors of child support payments is the current earnings of the nonresident parent. Increases in current earnings are associated with increases in child support payments.

McClanahan commented that the finding that fathers' current income matters is important, though income could be an endogenous factor. She also noted that there is a trade-off between having matched ex-couple data and population representativeness in this and similar studies. As Burt Barnow pointed out, following only couples that have lived together excludes information on many never-married couples who have never cohabited and thereby limits the available research on a substantial number of fathers and families.

Are family-related policies associated with child support awards and receipt?

Argys, Peters, Brooks-Gunn, and Smith used NLSY Geocode data to observe the effect of family-related policies on child support agreements and child support receipt. The family-related policies examined include child support guidelines designed to reduce large variation in award levels, state AFDC guarantee levels or the maximum amount of AFDC available to single parents with two children in the mother's state of residence in all post-disruption years, and paternity establishment rates in each state. They estimated logit regression equations for the probability of having a child support order and OLS regressions for the proportion of post-disruption years in which child support was received, including a measure of father-child contact in the past year and controlling for income and several family background characteristics.

Their findings vary by race and reason for father's absence. Among black mothers in the nonmarital sample, increases in AFDC guarantee levels are associated with declines in the likelihood of a child support award and in the incidence of child support receipt. Among the marital disruption sample, however, they found no significant associations. The existence of state child support guidelines increases the probability of a child support award but only for the white marital disruption sample. Higher paternity establishment rates are associated with the increased likelihood of a child support award among white mothers in the nonmarital sample, but there is no increase in the incidence of child support payments over the years. The authors pointed out that father-child contact is positively associated with child support receipt for black and white women in the nonmarital sample. The contact measure is also associated with increases in child support awards and receipt for the white mothers in the marital disruption sample.

Argys and her colleagues also estimated multinomial regressions to assess the effect of family policies on the type of child support award for the nonmarital and the marital disruption samples, providing further support for the distinction between court-ordered and cooperative child support awards. They observed that higher AFDC guarantee levels are associated with a decline in the probability of court-ordered support among mothers in the nonmarital sample, and proposed that women may be less likely to vigorously pursue awards when AFDC provides adequate support. The existence of state child support guidelines is associated with increases in the likelihood of cooperative child support for both the nonmarital and marital disruption samples. Effective paternity establishment is associated with increases in court-ordered but not cooperative awards among the nonmarital sample. Father-child contact is positively associated with cooperative child support for the nonmarital sample.

In sum, their policy-related variables show that higher state welfare benefits are associated with fewer court-ordered child support awards but have no effect on cooperative awards. Also, increases in state paternity establishment rates are associated with increases in court-ordered awards, while in contrast, child support guidelines promote cooperative awards.

What factors predict child support and father-child visitation among families on welfare?

Greene and Moore examined predictors of child support and father-child visitation in their study of mostly never-married, African American mothers and children on AFDC in Atlanta. As described in an earlier section of this report, their study includes formal child support, which refers to the cash payments that mothers who have voluntary or court-ordered awards receive from fathers through the formal child support enforcement system, and informal child support, which indicates cash or in-kind contributions fathers offer directly to mothers in addition to or in lieu of formal child support payments. Their analyses were based on mother-reported data from the JOBS Child Outcomes Study, and mother's characteristics constituted the majority of predictors. Due to data limitations, the predictor variables related to the father are whether paternity has been established, whether he lives in the same state as the focal child, whether, to the mother's knowledge, he has other children, and whether his family provides assistance for the child in the form of clothing, toys, presents, or child care.

Their regression equations reveal that only two predictors are significant and in the same direction for formal and informal child support and father-child visitation. Father's residence in the same state as the focal child and the provision of support for the child from the father's family are both associated with a higher likelihood of paternal involvement. The receipt of formal child support is also more likely when paternity has been established. In addition, mothers who report knowing that their child's father has other children are more likely to receive formal child support, as are mothers with a partner whom she describes as a father figure for the child. However, the likelihood of receiving formal child support declines as the child's age increases, even in a sample of children ages three to five. Also, mothers on welfare for less than two years are less likely to receive formal child support than those on welfare two to four years.

Informal child support and father-child visitation were found to be the most highly correlated of the three forms of involvement, and they share many of the same predictors. In addition to the aforementioned factors associated with all three forms of involvement, the likelihood of both informal child support and visitation increases among mothers who have

received welfare for less than two years compared to those on welfare for a longer duration. Proxies for the relationship between the mother and the father are also important in that both the receipt of informal child support and father-child visitation are less likely when the mother has a partner who is described as the child's father figure and when the mother does not know whether the father has other children. Associations limited to only one form of involvement show that fathers are less likely to contribute informal support when the mother has received welfare five or more years and less likely to visit their child in cases where the mother was a teenager when the child was born.

In discussing these findings, Robert Williams noted that, contrary to common belief, even unmarried fathers have contact with their children. Generally many of these fathers are willing to acknowledge a link to their children, but involvement declines over time. He pointed out that Greene and Moore report substantial involvement in a welfare sample, but it appears that only formal child support continues when the relationship between parents deteriorates. Mothers may be even more dependent on formal child support under Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), the new welfare reform.

What factors are associated with co-residence and visitation among fathers of nonmarital children?

Using father-reported data from the NLSY, Lerman and Sorensen estimated multinomial logit equations to identify determinants of maximum father involvement with nonmarital children as of the 1990 survey year. The measures of father involvement were no involvement, infrequent visits, frequent visits, and co-residence. Their explanatory equations included the age of the child, the age of the father, and father's characteristics, such as race or Spanish origin, total number of nonmarital and marital births, lagged earnings (high minus low earnings), math and verbal test scores, years of schooling, presence of own father while growing up, and religious attendance in 1979, when they were first interviewed for the NLSY.

Demographic findings revealed that after controlling for the other factors, black fathers are more likely to visit at least weekly but less likely to reside with their children than are white fathers, while Hispanic fathers are more likely both to visit frequently and to reside with their children. In these analyses, the child's age is negatively associated with involvement. Fathers of older children are less likely to visit frequently or reside with their children than fathers of younger children. Fathers' age does not appear to be associated with their involvement. However, their higher lagged earnings are associated with the increased likelihood of both co-residence and frequent visitation. Similarly, higher math test scores are related to the indicators of higher involvement. On the other hand, living apart from their own fathers while growing up reduced the likelihood of co-residence and visitation among these fathers, but neither their years of education nor their frequency of attendance at religious services in 1979 exerted effects. Lerman and Sorensen also found a positive association between fathers' other nonmarital and marital births and father involvement.

Frank Mott made a general comment on the data reported by men asserting that men are "terrible reporters" of some information, especially if they are not living with their children. Their reporting error is not random but instead tends to be self-serving. He also noted that mothers are not necessarily unbiased in their reporting of some information. Sensitive

information may include the existence of children, their dates of birth, visitation frequency, etc. Errors may result in undercounts of fatherhood and overestimates of child support and visitation. He also pointed out that it may be difficult to measure whether parents are married depending on whether the measure is taken during pregnancy, at the child's birth, or later.

Father Involvement and Outcomes among Young Children

One fundamental question of interest to both researchers and policy makers is whether father involvement promotes positive child outcomes. This section summarizes findings on associations between father involvement measures and outcomes among young children. Cathleen Zick, a discussant, suggested that future conceptual models in this area give greater attention to the gender of the child, age-specific effects, the interplay between mother and father involvement, and characteristics of the family environment shared by siblings. The findings presented here and in a later section on adolescent and young adult outcomes provide a firm basis for future conceptual and methodological research.

Is father care during the preschool years associated with later outcomes among children in two-parent families?

Averett, Gennetian, and Peters used NLSY data to examine the effects of retrospective data on early father care on child outcomes in the domains of cognitive development and behavioral adjustment for children ages five to eight in child assessment years. They include two measures of cognitive development: the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) and an average of math and reading recognition scores on the Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT). The Behavior Problems Index (BPI), a mother-reported assessment, serves as their measure of behavioral adjustment. In addition, the authors include an outcome measure of the children's reports of their feelings of closeness to their fathers, using a smaller sample of 10 to 14 year olds because of the age restriction on the self-administered section.

Results from regression analyses reveal that there is no association between child care arrangements and the child's score on the measure of behavior (BPI). However, findings show that the association between father care and the child's cognitive development differs by the age of the child. Children who were cared for by their father during the first year of life had higher scores on the PIAT and the PPVT than their counterparts who were in center-based child care, over and above factors including measures of parental resources, demographic characteristics, household composition, and mothers' math and reading scores. In contrast, compared to children in child care centers, children who were in father care during their second and third years have significantly lower scores on the same measures. Averett, Gennetian, and Peters offer the interpretation that parental care is most important during the first year of life but the social interactions and cognitive stimulation available through group activities may be more appropriate and beneficial for the developmental stages of years two and three. Additionally, they observed that father care during the first year of life has no significant effect on the probability of the child reporting feelings of extreme closeness to the father during middle childhood or early adolescence, but father care during the second or third year exerts a positive effect, though it falls short of being statistically significant.

The authors point out that policies like parental leave will promote father involvement during the child's first year of life. In addition, because father care is often linked to mother's work schedule, flexible work schedules, alternative work shifts, and flextime will facilitate maternal employment and encourage father care arrangements.

Are there differences in cognitive and behavioral outcomes among children living in one-parent versus two-parent families?

Jay Teachman, Randal Day, Karen Carver, Vaughn Call, and Kathleen Paasch analyzed the mean differences in cognitive and behavioral outcomes between children living in one-parent versus two-parent families. Teachman and his colleagues employed EQS structural equation modelling which, unlike commonly used regression approaches, allowed them to separate variation that occurs between families from variation that occurs within families. As Randal Day, the second author and presenter of the paper explained, they used longitudinal data for sibling pairs from the NLSY to examine the effect of father presence on children's cognitive and behavioral outcomes. Their sample consisted of sibling pairs who were no more than five years apart in age and whose living arrangements in two-parent or mother-only families remained the same between the 1988 and 1992 data collection years. In 1988, the mean age for the younger and older children in the sibling pairs was seven and ten years old, respectively. Their outcome measures for sibling comparisons were standardized scores of the Behavior Problems Index (BPI) and the Peabody Individual Achievement Tests (PIAT) for math and reading recognition.

The authors explained that their models do not include background characteristics of the family, but because siblings pairs are the unit of analysis the models naturally control for influences shared by both siblings, such as schools, neighborhoods, and parental resources. Their outcome measures are standardized scores normed by age, so differences over time are not reflective of developmental change among the siblings. Instead, differences over time indicate the effects of living in either a one-parent or two-parent family and reveal variation from a standard course of development. They estimated separate models for each outcome, then joint models with two-parent and one-parent families for each outcome and determined differences between models according to family type. Through complex methods, they were able to provide estimates of between-family and within-family variation in each outcome for older and younger siblings at both time points, 1988 and 1992.

Teachman and colleagues outlined the results for their numerous models. In sum, their findings are consistent with prior research that shows differences in cognitive and behavioral outcomes for children from one-parent versus two-parent families. It appears that children in one-parent families have more behavior problems and lower math and reading scores. The authors point out that variation in race composition between one-parent and two parent families does not account for the observed differences in scores. They note that a race effect exists, but the same pattern of results appears for both black and non-black families. The authors expected the differences in all scores for children from one-parent versus two-parent families to increase over time. However, only the gap in reading scores increases, and the disparity is notable for both older and younger siblings.

The authors note that the exact reason for the growth in disparity between children from one-and two-parent families occurs only for reading scores cannot be determined with existing data. However, they discuss a few possibilities. For instance, schools may serve to maintain consistent differences in BPI and mathematics by family type over time, or it may be that unlike reading scores, BPI and mathematics scores are only affected by differences in the family environments that occur at early ages of children's development and then become stable over time.

The authors further explain that there is no change over time for between family variance or variance by family type for BPI and mathematics scores. In the case of reading scores, the percent of between family variance declines over time for both types of families but somewhat more so for one-parent families, suggesting that influences outside of the family are involved in the decline of reading scores among children in one-parent families. Schools are not expected to be a cause of the decline, since they are considered to be a part of the family environment. The authors point out that the type of extra-familial influences affecting children in one-parent families cannot be determined from the data they used. They suggest that future research may reveal the influence of within-family factors for children in one-parent families, such as parental time inputs. Children in one-parent families may receive less parental supervision and therefore become more vulnerable to negative influences from outside the family realm. During the presentation of this paper, Day pointed that a remaining query is what fathers or others might bring to the reading scores of children but not to math or BPI scores.

Is child support associated with cognitive and behavioral outcomes among children?

Argys, Peters, Brooks-Gunn, and Smith used data from the NLSY to examine the effects of both cooperative and court-ordered child support awards and payments on child well-being in the domains of cognitive functioning and behavioral adjustment among black and white children ages five to eight. They performed separate analyses for children in nonresident-father families who are eligible for child support because of nonmarital childbearing versus those eligible because of marital disruption, and include a comparison group of children in resident-father families. Argys and her colleagues first assess the effects of child support receipt on two cognitive measures, the PPVT and an average of PIAT math and reading recognition scores. Their child support measure indicates the proportion of years in which the mothers received child support since union disruption, or since the birth of the child for the nonmarital sample. They include a dichotomous measure of some versus no father-child contact in the same year as the assessment, post-disruption family income, parents' educational attainment and other family background characteristics.

Argys and her colleagues observed differences by race and reason for father absence. For instance, among the nonmarital sample, the receipt of child support was associated with increases in PIAT scores for white children but had no effect on any of the outcomes for black children. In contrast, child support receipt was associated with increases in the PIAT and the PPVT among black children only in the marital disruption sample.

Is cooperative child support more beneficial to child well-being than court-ordered child support?

Argys and her colleagues also assessed the effects of the type of child support agreement on the selected child outcomes. The beneficial effects of child support appear to be greatest when the child support agreement is reached cooperatively rather than by court order. In this case, cooperative child support refers to cooperative agreements made with or without attorney assistance as well as cooperative contributions in the absence of a formal award, and both are related to improvements in child outcomes. For example, in the nonmarital sample, cooperative child support is associated with improvements in the three child outcome measures, but court-ordered child support is unrelated to child well-being. A similar but weaker pattern of results

emerged among the marital-disruption sample. According to Argys and her colleagues, these findings suggest that aggressive child support policies that order child support awards in cases where parents have not reached voluntary agreements offer fewer benefits to the child than anticipated.

Are formal and informal forms of child support associated with child outcomes among young children in families on welfare?

Greene and Moore estimated OLS regression equations to analyze the association between measures of father involvement, including two forms of child support, and selected child outcome measures for a sample of African-American preschoolers in families on AFDC. Their models included measures of father-child visitation, formal child support received through the child support enforcement system, and informal support, such as money, groceries, clothes, or other items given directly to the mother. Control variables related to the father were whether paternity has been established, whether he lives in the same state as the focal child, whether, to the mother's knowledge, he has other children, and whether his family provides assistance for the child in the form of clothing, toys, presents, or child care. Their models also controlled for child's age and gender and several maternal characteristics.

In general, findings for the child well-being measures show that monetary and material contributions from the father, especially contributions provided informally, are associated with somewhat more positive child outcomes. Both the payment of formal child support and the provision of informal child support by the biological father are associated with higher scores on the Personal Maturity Scale, a measure of emotional and behavioral development. In addition, informal child support, but not formal child support, is associated with higher scores on a measure of the quality of the child's home environment, the HOME-SF, particularly its cognitive stimulation subscale. The authors pointed out that if these findings are replicated in other more representative populations, they might suggest varied policy approaches ranging from helping families to leave welfare so they could receive child support payments in full directly from the father, to passing on an amount larger than the typical $50 dollars of the formal child support payment to a welfare mother and child. These data were collected before AFDC had been replaced with Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). How the new potentially stricter guidelines will interact to affect these findings is yet unknown.

Robert Williams suggested that TANF will make mothers more dependent on child support of the formal, nonvoluntary type, and child support awards may be higher in the absence of a welfare guarantee. He also noted that these findings highlight the importance of including measures of informal child support in studies of nonresident father involvement.

Is father-child contact associated with cognitive and behavioral outcomes?

As noted earlier, Argys and her colleagues included a measure of father-child contact in the same year as the assessment year. Their NLSY findings indicate that father-child contact is associated with increases in PIAT cognitive scores among black children in the nonmarital sample, and with fewer behavior problems among both black and white children in the marital disruption sample.

On the other hand, Greene and Moore found no evidence of a positive association between father-child visitation in the past year and the measures of cognitive and behavioral well-being or the quality of the child's home environment.

Is biological and nonbiological father involvement associated with child outcomes among low-income preschool-age children?

Black, Dubowitz, and Starr focused on the association between father involvement and child outcomes for a sample of low-income, African-American three-year-olds, many of whom were at risk for major health problems including HIV. The 82 biological fathers and nonbiological father figures who participated in the study completed a demographic questionnaire that asked about their education, employment status, relationship to the child, relationship to the child's mother, residential status, and financial contributions to the child's household. In addition, measures of father involvement included fathers' scores on a scale of child care and household tasks, an observational measure of paternal nurturance, and an indicator of parenting satisfaction measured by the Parent Sense of Competence Scale. The child outcomes the authors assessed were the Stanford Binet and the Peabody Picture Vaocabulary Test (PPVT), two measures of cognitve development; the Child Behavior Checklist, a measure of behavioral development; and the HOME, a measure of the child-centered quality of the child's home environment.

Black and her colleagues estimated a series of multiple regression equations to assess the relationship between fathers' roles and child outcomes, controlling for the child's health risk status, as well as maternal and paternal demographic characteristics. They tested for various interactions and moderating effects including the importance of maternal parenting satisfaction as a mediating variable.

The authors observed various positive effects of biological and nonbiological father involvement on all of the child outcomes over and above the other variables including maternal parenting satisfaction. For example, children's Stanford Binet scores are positively associated with paternal parenting satisfaction, and the association remained, though at a marginal level of significance, when maternal parenting satisfaction was added to the model. Both fathers' employment and their level of nurturance are positively associated with PPVT scores. In addition, children's behavior problems decline with increases in fathers' financial contributions and parenting satisfaction. Finally, the child-centered quality of the home improves when fathers reside in the home with their children.

Brooks-Gunn pointed out that this study and others presented during the segment on children at risk venture beyond contact and visitation in terms of what fathers provide. The construct of love would be a good addition to studies of this kind. She also noted the lack of studies of father involvement in low-income, high-risk families and acknowledged the importance of this study's results.

Father Involvement and Outcomes among Adolescents and Young Adults

Father involvement may affect outcomes throughout the life course of children. The preceding section presented outcomes for the early childhood period. This section summarizes findings for the association between father involvement and later outcomes. In fact, several authors employed longitudinal datasets, with youth-reported information, to examine whether and how father involvement during middle childhood and adolescence affects subsequent young adult outcomes.

Are fathers' activities during adolescence associated with later outcomes among young adults from two-parent families?

Duncan, Hill, and Yeung used data from the PSID to assess how father's characteristics, including involvement with their children during middle childhood and adolescence, affect the adult success of these children. The authors created their father variables and other independent measures based on data collected between 1968 and 1972 when the youth were between the ages of 10 and 17. Their youth outcome measures are years of schooling completed by the child as reported in 1995 or the most recent year available, as well as logged hourly earnings and family income relative to needs, both averaged over the two most recent years prior to 1993.

When Duncan, Hill ,and Yeung added father's characteristics to a baseline model of mother, child, and family characteristics, the explanatory power of the model increased. They observed that the father's wage rate was associated with increases in the years of completed schooling for boys and increases in the earnings and family incomes of both boys and girls. Father's education was associated with higher earnings and family income among girls and in increases in the education level of both boys and girls.

Duncan and his colleagues added father's activities and parental PTA involvement to subsequent models. They found that father's reports of attending church is a significant predictor of children's adult success. Father's church attendance was associated with increases in the educational attainment of boys and girls and of family income for boys. Of all the measures included in the analyses, parental PTA meeting attendance was consistently the most powerful predictor of the outcomes. PTA meeting attendance was predictive of all three attainment measures for both boys and girls. For instance, parental involvement in PTA meetings in the last three months as compared to attending but not within the last three months is associated with an increase of .15 years of school for both sons and daughters and 26 percent higher average hourly earnings for sons. Later models showed that father's risk avoidance, in terms of using seat belts, having car insurance, and having savings equal to at least two months of income, was associated with significant increases in the attainment measures of boys but had no effect on girls' attainment. Duncan and his colleagues point out that since adolescent boys are more prone to risk-taking behavior than adolescent girls, the potential for risk-averse fathers to reduce risk potential may be more important for boys than girls.

What are the effects of marital disruption and marital quality on subsequent relationships between parents and their adult children?

Terri Orbuch, Arland Thornton, and Jennifer Cancio examined how divorce and marital quality effect the quality of the relationship between parents and their children during the transition to adulthood. Their data are a segment of an intergenerational study of mothers and children that used a probability sample of white women in Detroit who gave birth to their first, second or fourth child in July, 1961. Their study focuses on data from interviews with mothers and their children at three time points, when their children were ages 18, 23, and 31. To measure marital disruption, Orbuch and her colleagues classified mothers into three categories where they defined continuously married between 1962 and 1980 as the reference group and created two dummy variables for the categories divorced and remarried and divorced and not remarried. They used five mother-reported indicators of the marital relationship to comprise marital quality measures for mothers who remained married to the child's biological father from 1962 to 1993. For all three data collection time points, high scores on the marital quality measure indicate high marital quality. Orbuch and colleagues also developed three summary measures of parent-child relationships, which include items pertaining to interpersonal communication, affection, and closeness between biological parents and their children. They were able to measure the quality of the parent-child relationship from the perspective of both the mother and the child, for each of the three time points.

In their series of regression equations, Orbuch and colleagues controlled for family and child characteristics that prior research suggests are associated with divorce and/or marital quality, such as the child's gender and birth order, whether the mother was pregnant at the time of the marriage, and mother's and father's education in 1962, the initial survey year. Their results reveal that neither the mother nor the adult child's perception of mother-child relationship quality is associated with parental divorce. However, parental divorce is associated with the child's perception of the quality of the father-child relationship. Compared to 18-year-olds with continuously married parents, those with mothers who are divorced and not remarried reported a lower quality relationship with their father. Orbuch and colleagues included the mother's religiosity and income as intervening measures and found that of the two, only income accounts for most of the negative association between divorce without remarriage and father-child relationship quality. Interactive effects with child's gender reveal that divorce without remarriage is detrimental to both the father-son and the mother-son bond, even more detrimental to the father-daughter bond, but beneficial to the mother-daughter bond. Mother's income when the child is age 18 accounts for most of the negative effect of divorce on the father-son relationship and a large portion of the negative effect on father-daughter relationships.

Orbuch and her colleagues also examined the effects of marital quality on parent-child relations over time. Their models included the control variables described earlier, in addition to religious denomination, religiosity, and income as measured in the same year as the parent-child relationship variable. Over and above these predictors, they found that marital quality is positively associated with the mother's perception of the mother-child relationship when the child is age 18 but not over time as the child reaches ages 23 and 31. Similarly, the marginally significant association between marital quality and the adult child's perception of the mother-child relationship at age 18 disappears in later years. In contrast, the significant positive association between mother reports of marital quality and the adult child's perception of the

father-child bond remains consistent over the years. Orbuch and colleagues conclude that adult children, as they age, differentiate their parent's marital climate from their relationship with their mother but not their relationship with their father. No significant gender differences emerged; however, overall trends suggest a stronger association between marital quality and father-daughter bonds than marital quality and father-son bonds.

Is there an association between father presence or father-son relationship quality during adolescence and patterns of family formation during adulthood?

Furstenberg focused on the effects of father presence and father-son closeness during adolescence on the fertility patterns and fathering behavior of young adult males. He was primarily interested in whether patterns of fertility and noninvolvement are reproduced intergenerationally. Furstenberg's research involved interviews with young, African American males who were the offspring of a sample of women in Baltimore studied since they became teen mothers in the mid-1960s. The young adult males provided information on both their biological fathers and stepfathers, including mothers' partners, regarding the quantity and quality of father-son interactions during childhood and mid-adolescence. As described in an earlier section of this report, Furstenberg's indicator of the quality of the father-son relationship was an index based on items measuring the degree of father-son closeness and the extent to which the son wanted to be like his father when he reached adulthood.

By the 1996 interview, the young men were in their late twenties. A full 65 percent reported having at least one child and 22 percent had become fathers during their teen years. About 30 percent of the young fathers were residing with their child at the time of the interview. Furstenberg calculated the odds ratios of the young men becoming fathers by their late twenties, and his preliminary findings suggest the importance of the presence of biological fathers. Compared to young males who resided with their biological fathers through adolescence, young males who had not lived with a father for more than five years and those who lived with their father for a longer period but not into adolescence were twice as likely to have had a child. However, the presence of a stepfather even into mid-adolescence had no significant effect on the outcome. In further support of these initial findings, Furstenberg noted that he was not able to test the association between co-residence patterns and teen fatherhood because none of the young males who resided with their biological father and only one who experienced the ongoing presence of a stepfather through mid-adolescence had become a father before age 20, whereas about 22 percent of males with sporadic or no fathering had become teen fathers.
As Brooks-Gunn noted during the discussion segment, sporadic fathering may be a disruptive influence in the lives of children and adolescents, and stepfather involvement is a key factor in the study of nonresident father involvement.

Among young males who were fathers by their late twenties, those who resided with their biological father were significantly more likely to be living with their own children. Growing up with a stepfather in the home also increased the likelihood that these young men would live with their children, but the effect was not significant. Furstenberg analyzed whether the quality of the father-son relationship modified the association between father presence and the timing of the son's first birth or the association between father presence and the son's co-residence with his child. He found that the father-son relationship measure had no effect on either association. In other words, closeness to the biological or stepfather neither reduces nor increases the risk of

what Furstenberg termed "irresponsible fatherhood" for young men whose fathers resided in the home or young males whose fathers lived elsewhere during their youth. Similarly, he found that the quality of the mother-son relationship did not modify the findings for father presence. Wendell Primus remarked that these findings need to be replicated, but it appears that biological fathers are especially important for teens. In other words, biology matters, although how and why remains to be determined.

Furstenberg investigated other possible reasons for the effects of father presence on later family formation, but the answers remain elusive. For example, analyses showed that while indicators of the family's economic well-being during childhood and adolescence were predictive of the birth timing and co-residence outcomes, these indicators of material resources did not account for the influence of father presence. Additionally, Furstenberg constructed an index of mother-reported items related to paternal influence and childrearing collaboration and found that none of the items separately or combined predicted the family formation outcomes or modified the effects of father presence.

Is father involvement associated with health risk behaviors among adolescents?

Harris presented very preliminary findings based on youth-reported data from the Adolescent Health Survey. She examined whether family structure or father involvement were associated with nine heath risk factors among adolescents including whether adolescents had ever had sex, smoked cigarettes, smoked marijuana, tried crack, run away from home, driven while intoxicated (DWI), been high on drugs in school, been in a fight, or considered suicide. Overall, her preliminary bivariate findings for family structure consistently show that adolescents who live with both biological parents are less likely than adolescents in the remaining six family forms to engage in health risk behaviors. In contrast, youth living in single father families and those living in other nonparental family forms consistently were more likely to engage in the selected risk behaviors.

Harris created an indicator of high father involvement by combining the optimal categories of four measures: one or more shared activities with the father, very or extremely close to father, no conflict over behavior, talked about two or more topics with father. To observe whether high father involvement may mitigate the association between family structure and health risk behaviors, she analyzed proportions for adolescents with highly involved fathers versus other fathers across family structures for ever had sex, smoked marijuana, run away from home, and DWI. A consistent pattern emerged. Across family structures and outcomes, youth who have highly involved fathers are less likely to engage in health risk behaviors. Adolescents who have highly involved fathers in two-parent biological families have the lowest levels of risk. Although high father involvement in the other family structures is never associated with risk levels below those of adolescents with highly involved fathers in two-parent biological families, high involvement in other family structures is associated with risk levels below the average for all adolescents in two-parent biological families. Harris stressed the need for caution in interpreting her findings, emphasizing that they are preliminary, unweighted, descriptive, and mostly bivariate.

Father Involvement and Outcomes for Fathers

As reflected by the preceding sections of this report, most authors addressed the major conference theme by examining the effects of father involvement on child outcomes. However, some research suggests that fathers themselves may benefit from remaining involved in the lives of their children. During a discussion segment, Robert Willis noted that a few studies find a causal effect of children on the earnings capacity of men and hypothesize that men who become disconnected from their children may lose their incentive to work. Lerman and Sorensen explored a related question.

Is fathers' involvement with their nonmarital children associated with fathers' earnings?

Lerman and Sorensen described their preliminary findings based on data from the NLSY. To analyze the association between father involvement and the father's subsequent earnings, they created six dummy variables for father involvement including visited less than once per month, visited one to three times per month, visited at least once per week, lived with the child but not the mother, not married but lived with the child and the mother, and married and lived with the child and the mother; no visitation in the past year was the reference category. In their multivariate regression analyses, the dependent variable was father's earnings after the observed visitation period, and the independent variables were personal characteristics such as father's age, race/ethnicity, level of education, and math and verbal test scores. In addition, Lerman and Sorensen estimated regression equations that controlled for prior earnings and those that did not control for prior earnings. Findings were similar with or without the inclusion of prior earnings.

According to Lerman and Sorensen, the highest earnings levels and gains over prior earnings were found among fathers who married and lived with the mother and the nonmarital child. Similarly, fathers who cohabited with the mother and child outside of formal marriage had higher earnings than fathers who lived with the child but not the mother and fathers in the three visitation categories. However, fathers who visited at least once per week and fathers who lived with the child but not the mother had lower earnings than fathers who visited less frequently, for instance, three times a month or less often. The authors suggested cautious interpretation of the findings especially since the analyses do not account for fathers' entire past involvement with their children. As they noted, various processes may influence the association between fathers' earnings and their involvement. For example, close involvement may motivate fathers to acquire valuable work experience that later results in higher earnings even when fathers become less involved with their children. The speculated that an analysis of father involvement over time may reveal that consistent father involvement over the years leads to higher earnings or perhaps no higher earnings than contemporaneous involvement.

What do these findings suggest? : Wrap up and conclusion session

The final panel was comprised of Elizabeth Peters of Cornell University, Wade Horn of the National Fatherhood Initiative, and Nancy Hoit, Advisor to Vice President Gore and Consultant to the National Performance Review. Peters began the segment by highlighting a few of the prevailing themes of the conference. For instance, she pointed out that one salient query is how to measure father involvement. Research shows that father presence and father absence are not adequate indicators of involvement; in fact, measures of child care, activities, closeness, money, provisioning, visitation, and custody are only some of the many indicators of father involvement. Overall, existing data sources include some information about the nature and quality of father-child interactions in intact families and far less detail about relationships between nonresident fathers and their children, beyond child support and frequency of visitation. Peters noted that a great deal can be learned from research on intact two-parent families, but it is important not to make generalizations across family types or household structures. Father involvement appears to vary by, for instance, household structure and race/ethnicity, so including interaction terms in data analysis is important to the study of father involvement. The relationship between the mother and father also appears to be important. In addition, economic support and nurturing seem to be important separately as well as interactively.

Peters also pointed out that policy implications differ for intact and nonintact families. For example, important policies for intact, two-parent families, such as those related to child care and family leave provisions, should offer support for family and work roles. Among nonintact families, perhaps policy efforts should promote not only child support collection but also more direct father involvement. In an earlier discussion segment, Ed Pitt cautioned against assuming that father involvement necessarily enhances child outcomes. Peters also acknowledged that father involvement is not necessarily good for the child in all cases. Policies and program interventions should promote positive father involvement, perhaps during the divorce process or paternity establishment by facilitating communication between parents and offering parents assistance to find employment and needed services.

According to Wade Horn, there appear to be two major perspectives on father involvement. The first suggests that fathers assume a unique and important role in the lives of their children, and the second views fathers as an economic provider and a nonspecific second pair of hands. Those who adhere to the former perspective will seek policies to involve the biological father and those who adhere to the latter will focus on child support enforcement and advocate substituting father figures or other caring adults for nonresident biological fathers in their children's lives. Horn questioned why it appears that fathers but not mothers have to prove that they enhance the lives of their children. He also pointed out that involvement is regarded differently for resident and nonresident fathers. The economic provider role is deemed salient among nonresident fathers; whereas among resident fathers, the emphasis is on the time they spend with their children and the nurturance they provide rather than their economic provider role. He referred to this contrast as a double standard that researchers and policy makers need to address.

Horn noted that marriage was given relatively little attention in the research presented. He asserted that marriage is the surest route to father involvement and that prior research shows cohabitation to be a weak substitute for marriage. Additionally, fathers who visit their children

monthly or even weekly are not as engaged in the lives of their children as are fathers who coreside in the home. According to Horn, some researchers are on the verge of creating a myth that marriage does not matter by suggesting that unmarried or divorced nonresident fathers will maintain a high level of involvement with their children.

Horn acknowledged the importance of examining the effects of father involvement on fathers as well as children. He proposed analyzing males' transition from boyhood to manhood to gain insight into factors that may influence their desire or ability to assume paternal roles. During a discussion segment early on, Ed Pitt stressed the importance of determining how to prepare children to become parents and boys to become fathers in the context of diverse family structures. Horn recommended the provision of rites of passage and other programs to facilitate the transition to manhood, quality education and employment opportunities to offer alternatives to early fatherhood or support fathering responsibilities, and long-term policies that encourage and sustain marriage.

Nancy Hoit began by stating that she was very glad to hear the word "love" surface in some of the conference presentations. She maintained that researchers sometimes lose the power and intimacy of father-child relationships in their efforts to quantify human interactions. However, she recognized the importance of measuring and quantifying father involvement, and commended the research community for taking on the task.

Hoit noted Vice President Gore's personal and public commitment to issues pertaining to fathers and families and described recent father-related activities, some of which brought together civic leaders and policy officials. She posed the question of what the government can do to address fathers' issues and referred to the need for new attitudes and assumptions about fathers. Hoit noted that one proactive approach includes examining the existing body of research. Community efforts also offer important insights. She referred to community programs described during the Federal Staff Conference on Fatherhood held on May 3, 1996. Several vignettes suggested that low-income fathers who were assisted in securing employment were likely to remain involved with their children. In fact, some propose that the biggest connector to employment for a man is his love for his child.

Regarding research, Hoit emphasized the importance of finding underrepresented men during data collection efforts and the importance of discussing the wide array of fathers and not just the extremes of poor, young, African-American fathers and older, middle-class, white fathers. She also mentioned the need for more information on the "really human part" of fatherhood. Hoit thanked the research community for their hard work and encouraged them to forge ahead. In closing, she noted that Vice President Gore always says, "If you're having trouble figuring out why dads are important, just ask a child."

The Methodology Workshop

As described in the introduction to this report, a three-hour workshop was held after the conference on Saturday, October 12, 1996. It was organized to provide a forum for more in-depth discussion of mainly methodological issues related to the study of father involvement. The Methodology Workshop consisted of two panels and time allotted for general discussion among the diverse group of attendees. The first panel was comprised of Arland Thornton, Randal Day, Bill Marsiglio, and Elizabeth Peters representing the disciplines of demography, family science, sociology, and economics, respectively. The panelists referred to conference findings and implications, offered new insights and recommendations, and initiated the general discussion that followed their presentations.

During his introduction to the Methodology Workshop, Jeff Evans explained that the conference in March 1997 represents a unique opportunity to rapidly improve the research base on fatherhood and male fertility by providing a viable plan of action. At this time, fatherhood initiatives have bipartisan support. In fact, new federally supported data initiatives are in planning, and principal investigators are willing to consider additions and revisions to national surveys, such as the Panel Survey of Income Dynamics (PSID), the 1997 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY97), the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS), and the Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD). Evans also noted that there may be a new broadly supported fatherhood initiative introduced for the new millennium. He emphasized the importance of generating a set of sound research priorities that draw on various disciplinary and methodological approaches.

Father involvement as a complex process

Thornton initiated the first panel's presentations by explaining that fatherhood is part of a complex interrelated system that includes multiple actors and multiple dyads. For example, there is the mother-father dyad which affects and is affected by children, grandparents, stepparents, neighborhoods, etcetera. Thornton emphasized the importance of studying the key parts of the system and how they are interrelated. As he and many workshop participants noted, to do so effectively, multiple respondents are necessary. Thornton also asserted that researchers must learn how to measure obscure constructs related to what motivates motherhood and fatherhood and what produces or disrupts bonds between members of dyads. Additionally, values, attitudes, religiosity, and concepts like love and altruism are important to the study of fathers and families.

Similarly, Day pointed out that it is important to capture and maintain the complexities that exist in the real world. Simplistic coding schemes can reduce rich data to the level of nearly meaningless stereotypes. Like Thornton, he referred to James Garbarino's dinner speech which included a discussion of spirituality and the deep inner value attached to fathering. Concepts like generosity, love, soul, and caring are salient, yet seemingly elusive, factors in the study of fathers, families, and relationships. In addition, Day noted that large data bases tend to omit constructs that are critical to the study of interactions between parents and children, including distance regulation, intrusiveness, supervision, and monitoring.

Referring to findings from the Conference on Father Involvement, Peters noted that the many dimensions of father involvement, including money, time, and psychological inputs, are

not fully captured by investigators. Various projects and surveys incorporate indicators of father involvement, but they do not thoroughly integrate them, so many questions remain. Peters pointed out that father involvement appears to vary by family structure, but additional research Is needed to determine the common and unique types of involvement and factors that influence involvement across intact and nonintact family forms. For instance, the quality of the relationship between the mother and father appears be associated with the nature and degree of both resident and nonresident father involvement.

Additionally, although the father's provider role is a salient theme in general little is known about the association between household income and, for instance, child well-being outcomes. According to Peters, research presented at a recent poverty conference suggests that money is important to child well-being for specific child outcomes at specific ages. But, exactly how and why money matters is still unclear. A missing link appears to be information on how household income is spent. However, even the Consumer Expenditure Survey provides little information on how money is spent on children. Peters asserted that both income and expenditure patterns are important to child well-being. There are important unanswered questions regarding how household income is spent, whether mothers and fathers spend money on children differently, and whether differing spending patterns affect child well-being.

Approaches to the study of fathers

Thornton pointed out that many studies are saturated with dependent variables and lack important explanatory variables. He proposed a greater focus on process, causation and explanation, which necessitates the inclusion of additional explanatory or predictor variables. Thornton also emphasized the importance of integrating process and methods, noting Barry Hewlett's recommendation that researchers begin to do "transdisciplinary" work. Researchers too often work in isolation; however, the transdisciplinary approach offsets this tendency by requiring collaboration across disciplines. Thornton recommended additional multi-method projects that integrate observational and ethnographic approaches with large-scale survey designs. Similarly, Day cited the need for multi-level, multidimensional research to attempt to unravel existing complexities. Marsiglio asserted that an important decision is whether to undertake one or two comprehensive or focused projects or many small projects.

Marsiglio outlined several fundamental considerations pertaining to the study of fathers. For instance, defining fathers is an important first step, and Marsiglio suggested that the definition extend beyond biological fathers to include social fathers, such as step fathers, adoptive fathers, and the mother's partner. In many cases, biological fathers live outside the home and their children are influenced by the males who reside with the children and assume fathering roles. Marsiglio also suggested that topical areas of importance for the fatherhood working groups are, for instance, biological resident fathers, biological nonresident fathers, stepfathers, single biological fathers, and young unwed fathers.

He noted that researchers must address timing issues related to whether studies on fathers begin at the birth of their child, during pregnancy, prior to pregnancy, or whenever it is possible to involve them. He recommended approaches that begin before men become fathers and incorporate male life course issues, especially as they vary across cultures. Important issues include how males evolve over their life course in general and relate to school, work, and other

institutions; male partnering in sexual relationships and how this relates to other life trajectories including their parenting role; and how father-child relationships develop and change over time.

Survey design issues

The genetic design. When the general discussion began, Christine Bachrach pointed out that the intergenerational effects of how fathers behave have received only modest attention even though, for example, genetically-based similarities may affect child outcomes. Therefore, informative research in this area should include genetic measures to thoroughly account for the influence of genetic variations on the outcomes of interest. Mindful of the controversial nature of the subject, Bachrach explained that genetic approaches do not have to lead to theories of genetic determinism. Marsiglio noted that sociobiological research represents an important yet undervalued area that is often either dismissed or misinterpreted.

As an example of available data for the genetic approach, Bachrach referred to the Adolescent Health Survey, which includes fraternal and identical twins and full and half siblings. Thornton noted that the nature versus nurture debate has become very complex and the evidence for genetic effects is so compelling that it may be necessary to pursue research beyond twin studies. Sandra Hofferth suggested that this type of research may have to be part of smaller designs embedded within larger studies. At the very least, surveys should obtain accurate detail on relationships, such as biological versus step siblings and full versus half siblings.

Longer versus larger surveys. Greg Duncan referred to the Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD) regarding the possibility of appending additional father-related items to existing surveys. He pointed out that the SPD will require about two hours to complete; however, respondents are generally cooperative because family members like to talk about family issues. Duncan acknowledged that the survey is expensive but noted that most researchers would choose a long survey over a larger sample. In fact, the cost of lengthening a survey is less than the cost of adding households. The over-sampling of strategic populations can ensure representativeness even when the sample size is limited to a less than ideal number. However, Freya Sonenstein asserted that halving the sample size may be a problem for sampling some subgroups. Additionally, James Sweet pointed out that over-sampling specific groups may not meet the needs of researchers since all issues cannot be anticipated in advance of data collection. Vaughn Call suggested that sampling strategies are not problematic if the questions to be addressed in the surveys are known prior to making decisions about sample design.

The unit of analysis. Ron Mincy pointed out that several data collection efforts are under way; but, as long as the family and household are the unit of analysis, researchers will lack important information. The individual should be the unit of analysis and the focus of data collection efforts. Surveys should be designed to find and follow men regardless of their household status or attachment. According to Sonenstein, the working group on Male Fertility and Family Formation recognizes the problems associated with reliance on household sampling frames, when so many men are incarcerated or in the military. Hofferth explained that, in the PSID, males are followed even into prison for follow-up interviews. In the 1990's, the PSID implemented data collection strategies to follow men after marital disruption. Greg Duncan noted that both the PSID and the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) attempt to

follow individuals in families that separate, but the response rate is lower among these individuals.

The selection of survey topics

Setting priorities. Recognizing present budget constraints, Ron Mincy emphasized the importance of setting priorities for survey topics. Kristin Moore pointed out that the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) has made great progress in developing content that links family processes with labor market factors, but the problem is that many potential items had to be cut from the survey. As Jeanne Griffith noted, respondents like to answer family-related questions, but recently-pasted legislation restricts questionnaire content. For instance, the Grassly Amendment stipulates that interviewers cannot ask children about seven sensitive areas. In fact, a recent survey could not include an item that asks children whether or not they live with their father. Griffith recommended that when the social science researchers propose specific survey items, they prepare to explain why the data are necessary.

Developing a male template. There was general consensus among participants that much of what we know about fathers comes from asking mothers, but we need to ask fathers directly. Jeff Evans referred to the use of the "female template" to study males and asked participants how they would develop a male template. Ron Henry recommended asking men what their goals are for their children. Andrea Beller acknowledged the importance of determining what fathers do that differs from what mothers do.

Hofferth suggested that researchers develop topics on fathering from the perspective of quantity versus quality of time spent with children. In a related comment, Henry pointed out that men's relationship to work limits their time with their children, but as children reach adolescence they too become busy with various activities. Therefore, the quantity of time children spend with their parents becomes less important than other issues.

Waldo Johnson described his experience interviewing fathers in Chicago for a small-scale study. He discovered that many of the original survey items were more appropriate for mothers than fathers. After his team revised the instrument to reflect issues of interest to fathers, the young men became more willing to participate and gave more complete responses. Donna Cochran referred to focus groups she conducted with African American men, where she asked them an open-ended question about how they learned to parent. The fathers appreciated the opportunity to express themselves and provided very full and candid accounts.

Peters suggested the involvement of focus groups and ethnographers early on to design questions. Henry pointed out that there are hundreds of men's groups who could help researchers gain access to men and develop appropriate questions. Chris Bachrach agreed that qualitative methods can enhance survey development but emphasized the importance of using rigorous methods. For instance, if focus group sessions include volunteers from motivated men's groups, it would be necessary to provide balance by involving men recruited from other sources.

The four working groups

Four working groups have been formed to develop specific recommendations on how to improve federal data on fathers and male fertility. Each working group is comprised of experts from academia, government, and the private sector. The second panel consisted of the co-chair of the four working groups, each of whom provided an overview of their group's tasks and activities associated with the March conference.

The panel was moderated by Linda Mellgren, co-chair of the working group on Targets of Opportunities and Trade-Offs, which is charged with the task of integrating and prioritizing the recommendations that are presented at the March conference. Mellgren's introduction to the session included four relevant lessons learned a decade ago during the implementation of a pilot survey of absent parents. First, policy makers and potential funders must view the costs associated with the research endeavor as worthwhile. The pilot study team discovered that it was possible to locate absent fathers, but overall efforts were at least three times as costly as expected. In this case, the value of extending the investigation beyond the pilot phase was not deemed worth the expense. Second, there should be a mechanism in place, like the Interagency Forum, to facilitate consensus building across agencies. During the pilot study, the various agencies within the sponsoring federal department lacked coordination and cooperation. Third, it is important to make the connection between policy and research. In this case, the study revealed a clear mismatch between policy and research goals: policy makers wanted to increase the effectiveness of child support enforcement tools or methods, while researchers were most interested in learning more about why fathers failed to pay support. Fourth, there may be a lag time between current research findings and the understanding of policy makers. In other words, sometimes research does not become important to policy makers until months or years after the findings are released. The pilot survey of absent fathers was conducted a decade ago, but its content and findings are relevant to policy discussions today.

Chris Bachrach, co-chair of the working group on male family formation and fertility, stressed the importance of learning how and why males become fathers in order to fully understand fathering. Notions of what it takes to be a father affect fertility-related behavior, and when and under what circumstances fatherhood occurs affect how men act as fathers. The working group is addressing issues of both male and female fertility and examining factors that lead to cohabitation, marriage, separation, and marital dissolution. They intend to review existing research and data on male fertility and union formation; identify gaps in existing data, knowledge, and theory; and identify the types of data that must be collected to address research gaps. According to Bachrach, some of the research gaps appear to be in the area of fertility among men in their twenties or older, fertility within nonmarital partnerships, and theory development. In fact, working group members have noted a lack of vocabulary to discuss and describe male fertility in contrast to an extensive vocabulary pertaining to female fertility.

Bachrach also highlighted a few methodological issues that are relevant to all four working groups. For instance, researchers must address the fundamental issues of how to measure fertility and other related factors; how to reach men and gain their cooperation; how to analyze data and address selectivity effects related to study participation; and how to model dyadic processes, such as the status of male-female relationships over time.

Jeff Evans, co-chair of the working group on conceptualizing male parenting, explained that his working group is seeking new ways of conceptualizing fathers in surveys and other data collection efforts. The multidisciplinary team is charged with identifying both the short-term and long-term opportunities for improving data on male parenting. Their work proceeds from the presumption that researchers are asking the wrong questions and, in fact, are not yet certain of the correct questions to ask. Evans noted that some researchers are motivated to know more about the association between father involvement and child well-being, while others are interested in the study of fathers for the sake of fathers themselves. The working group has identified five focal areas of father involvement: motivation, provisioning (provider roles), time use, structural barriers, and family processes. Their working paper will define father involvement; summarize research in the five identified areas of father involvement; assess existing information from available data sets; identify the connection between father involvement and government; and provide recommendations.

The working group on the methodology of survey research on fathers will examine the various approaches available for enrolling and retaining men in studies and for better obtaining information from them once they are in the study. Jeanne Griffith, co chair of the working group, explained that the three fundamental issues are how to find fathers, how to convince them to participate in the research endeavor, and determining the most appropriate questions to ask fathers. Griffith noted the need to delve into substantive issues about fathering and male fertility in order to propose appropriate research methods. The working group has discussed whether their focus should be nonresident fathers and decided to include all fathers to facilitate comparisons across groups. They are thinking most about fathers in relation to children. Griffith emphasized the importance of thinking broadly about issues because short-term policy questions are ephemeral and new data collection efforts will not be in the field for years. However, she also pointed out that there are opportunities for additions and supplements to current data collection efforts.

Mellgren explained that the working group on targets of opportunities and trade-offs will compose a viable plan of action based on the synthesized and prioritized recommendations of the other working groups. They will present the plan of action to the Interagency Forum during their meeting in July, 1997.

Evans concluded the Methodology Workshop by encouraging participants to maintain their resolve to place fathers at the forefront of the research agenda.

The following list contains the names and affiliations of participants whose comments are reflected in the preceding summary of the Methodology Workshop.

Christine Bachrach, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
Andrea Beller, University of Illinois
Vaughan Call, Brigham Young University
Donna Cochran, Wayne State University
Randal Day, Washington State University
Greg Duncan, Northwestern University
V. Jeffery Evans, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
Jeanne Griffith, National Center for Education Statistics
Ron Henry, Men's Health Network
Sandra Hofferth, University of Michigan
Waldo Johnson, University of Chicago
William Marsiglio, University of Florida
Linda Mellgren, Department of Health and Human Services
Ron Mincy, The Ford Foundation
Kristin Moore, Child Trends, Inc.
H. Elizabeth Peters, Cornell University
Freya Sonenstein, The Urban Institute
James Sweet, University of Wisconsin
Arland Thornton, University of Michigan

APPENDIX
List of Conference Papers

Session I: An Introduction

Father involvement: Theoretical perspectives from economics
Robert J. Willis, University of Michigan

Fathers' involvement with minor children: Sociological themes
William Marsiglio, University of Florida

Father involvement: A developmental psychological perspective
Ross D. Parke, University of California, Riverside

Culture and sex: Anthropological perspectives on father involvement
Barry S. Hewlett, Washington State University

Session II: Involvement in Intact Families

Sibling resemblance in behavioral and cognitive outcomes: The role of father presence
Jay Teachman, Washington State University
Randal Day, Washington, State University
Karen Carver, University of North Carolina
Vaughn Call, Brigham Young University
Kathleen Paasch, Washington State University

Fathers as providers of child care
Susan Averett, Lafayette College
Lisa A. Gennetian, Cornell University
H. Elizabeth Peters, Cornell University

Fathers' activities and children's attainments
Greg J. Duncan, Northwestern University
Martha Hill, University of Michigan
Jean Yeung, University of Michigan

Session III: Unmarried Fathers

Father involvement with their nonmarital children: Patterns, determinants, and effects on their earnings
Robert Lerman, The Urban Institute
Elaine Sorensen, The Urban Institute

Nonresident father involvement among young children in families on welfare
Angela Dungee Greene, Child Trends, Inc.
Kristin Anderson Moore, Child Trends, Inc.

Contributions of absent fathers to child well-being: Impact of child support dollars and father-child contact
Laura M. Argys, University of Colorado, Denver
H. Elizabeth Peters, Cornell University
Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Teachers College, Columbia University
Judith R. Smith, Teachers College, Columbia University

Session IV. Father's Involvement After Marital Dissolution - I

The single father family: Recent trends in demographic, economic, and public transfer use characteristics
Brett V. Brown, Child Trends

The impact of divorce, remarriage, and marital quality on the relationships between parents and their children
Terri L. Orbuch, University of Michigan
Arland Thornton, University of Michigan
Jennifer Cancio, University of Michigan

Involving fathers in the post-divorce family
Sanford L. Braver, Arizona State University
William A. Griffin, Arizona State University

Session V. Father's Involvement After Marital Dissolution - II

Nonresidential parents' economic ties to children: New evidence from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics
Pamela J. Smock, University of Michigan
Wendy D. Manning, Bowling Green State University

Father by law: Effects of joint legal custody on nonresident fathers' involvement with children
Judith A. Seltzer, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Session VI. Fathers of Children at Risk

African American fathers in low- income, urban families: Development and behavior of their 3-year-old children
Maureen M. Black, University of Maryland School of Medicine
Howard Dubowitz, University of Maryland School of Medicine
Raymond H. Starr, Jr., University of Maryland Baltimore County

Intergenerational transmission of fathering roles in at risk families
Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr., University of Pennsylvania

The impact of family structure and father involvement on risk behavior among adolescents
Kathleen Mullan Harris, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill